

**"Deuteronomic Re-presentation in a Word of Exhortation"**

**An Assessment of the Paraenetic Function of Deuteronomy**  
**in the letter to the Hebrews**

**David Mark Allen**

**Doctor of Philosophy**  
**University of Edinburgh**  
**2007**

## **Declaration**

**I declare that this thesis has been composed by me, that it represents my own research and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.**

---

David Allen

## **Thesis Abstract**

Scholarly study of the Letter to the Hebrews over the last century has devoted a great deal of attention to the use of the Old Testament within the Christian text. Such attention has focused upon diverse issues such as the source *Vorlage* available to the author, his exegetical and hermeneutical methodologies, and his treatment of themes such as priesthood, covenant, cult, rest or eschatology. Occasionally, scholars have produced substantive analysis of the use of particular texts, such as Ps 110, or Jer 31, but comparatively little attempt has yet been made to assess how an entire narrative or book functions within the letter.

Bearing this in mind, this thesis examines the way in which the book of Deuteronomy operates within the paraenetic sections of Hebrews, both at a micro-level (in terms of citation or allusion to the prior text) and at a macro-level (how broad Deuteronomic themes are treated within the discourse). There is extensive treatment of Deuteronomic quotations and echoes, as well as analysis of Hebrews' borrowing of Deuteronomy's covenantal blessing/cursing imagery. The thesis also focuses on the way in which Hebrews shares Deuteronomy's sermonic tone and paraenetic urgency, and how both texts rhetorically position their audience at the threshold of entry into their salvation goal, typified by the promised land. It discusses how Hebrews replays Deuteronomy's use of the wilderness generation as the paradigm of covenantal disobedience and how both texts exhibit a complex interweaving of the past, present and future moments. Finally, it examines the extent to which Hebrews stands in the tradition of 're-presentations' of Deuteronomy, echoing the way in which other 2nd Temple Jewish texts alluded to it for the purposes of their respective communities.

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Title page</b>	i
<b>Declaration</b>	ii
<b>Thesis Abstract</b>	iii
<b>Table of Contents</b>	iv
<b>Abbreviations</b>	vii
<b>Chapter 1: The Relationship between Hebrews &amp; Deuteronomy</b>	1
1.1 Introduction & History	1
1.2 Deuteronomy as text	7
1.3 Methodology/Intertextuality	12
1.4 Thesis Outline	16
<b>Chapter 2: The Text and Function of the Song of Moses</b>	20
2.1 Deuteronomy in Second Temple Judaism	20
2.2 The Form and Use of the Song of Moses	21
2.2.1 The Song of Moses in Deuteronomy	21
2.2.2 Background of Research and Issues	29
2.2.3 Exegesis of the Song	33
2.2.4 Summary	40
2.3 The Use of the Greater Song outside Deuteronomy	41
2.4 Conclusion	46
<b>Chapter 3: Deuteronomical Citation in the text of Hebrews</b>	47
3.1 The Deuteronomical Quotations in Hebrews	47
3.1.1 Heb 1:6 (Deut 32:43 LXX)	47
3.1.1.1 Heb 1:6 & Ps 96:7 LXX	47
3.1.1.2 Heb 1:6 & Deut 32:43 LXX	49
3.1.1.3 Heb 1:6 & Odes 2:43 LXX	55
3.1.1.4 The Function of Deut 32:43 in Heb 1:6	56
3.1.2 Heb. 10:30a (Deut 32:35)	62
3.1.3 Heb. 10:30b (Deut 32:36)	65
3.1.4 Heb. 12:21 (Deut 9:19)	67
3.1.4.1 Heb 12:21 & Exod 3:1-6/Acts 7:32	68
3.1.4.2 Heb 12:21 as Christian exegesis	69
3.1.4.3 Heb 12:21 & Deut 9:19	70
3.1.5 Heb 12:29 (Deut 4:24/9:3)	72
3.1.6 Heb 13:5 (Deut 31:6)	74
3.2 Deuteronomical Strong Allusions in Hebrews	77
3.2.1 Deut 32:15/Heb 3:12	78

3.2.2 Deut 17:6/Heb 10:28	82
3.2.3 Deut 1:10, 10:22, 28:62/Heb 11:12	83
3.2.4 Deut 8:5/Heb 12:2	86
3.2.5 Deut 29:18b/Heb 12:15b	90
3.2.6 Deut 4:11-12, 5:22-27/Heb 12:18-21	96
3.3 Deuteronomistic Echoes in Hebrews	101
3.3.1 Deut 32:46/Heb 2:1	101
3.3.2 Deut 32:47/Heb 4:12	104
3.3.3 Deut 32:4/Heb 10:23	107
3.3.4 Deut 32:35b/Heb 10:25	109
3.3.5 Deut 20:3/Heb 12:3	111
3.3.6 Deut 29:18a/Heb 12:15a	113
3.4 Deuteronomistic Narrative Allusions in Hebrews	115
3.4.1 Deut 33:2/Heb 2:2	115
3.4.2 Deut 32:8/Heb 2:5	117
3.4.3 Deut 1:38, 3:28, 31:7, 31:23/Heb 4:8	119
3.5 Conclusion	119
<b>Chapter 4: Thematic parallels between Hebrews and Deuteronomy</b>	121
4.1 Introduction – covenant/ברית	121
4.1.1 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and Covenant Obligation	124
4.1.2 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and the Centrality of Covenant	131
4.1.3 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and the Notion of 'New Covenant'	134
4.1.4 Conclusion	138
4.2 Blessing/Cursing Imagery in Hebrews	139
4.2.1 Heb 6:4-8	139
4.2.2 Heb 12:16-17	148
4.2.3 Heb 10:26-31	154
4.2.4 Heb 2:1-4	155
4.2.5 Heb 3:7-4:11	156
4.2.6 Blessing & Cursing: Summary	157
4.3 Deuteronomy/Hebrews & the Land	157
4.3.1 Introduction: Deuteronomy and the Land	157
4.3.2 Heb 3:7-4:11	160
4.3.3 Other appeals to land imagery	164
4.3.4 Heb 11	166
<b>Chapter 5: Homiletical Affinities between Hebrews and Deuteronomy</b>	171
5.1 Introduction	171
5.2 The Rhetoric of Hebrews and Deuteronomy	174
5.2.1 Hebrews as Valedictory Address	176
5.2.2 Hebrews as Deuteronomistic Valediction	185

5.2.3 Case Study – Heb 9:15-18	190
5.2.4 Summary	199
5.3 Then/Now Rhetoric	199
5.3.1 Then/Now Rhetoric in Deuteronomy	199
5.3.2 Then/Now Rhetoric in Deuteronomy in Hebrews	206
5.4 The Journey towards a Threshold	213
5.5 Conclusion	217
<b>Chapter 6: Hebrews and Deuteronomic Re-presentation</b>	218
6.1 Introduction	218
6.2 Deut 28-34 and Israel's history	218
6.3 Hebrews and Deuteronomic Re-presentation	223
6.3.1 Expansion or Rewriting of the Tradition	227
6.3.2 Torah Status	230
6.3.3 Re-presentation of Sinai	234
6.3.4 Mosaic Provenance or Association	238
<b>Chapter 7: Conclusion</b>	245
<b>Bibliography</b>	247

## Abbreviations

Abbreviated forms represent those listed in Patrick H. Alexander et al. (eds.) *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
AJT	<i>Asia Journal of Theology</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Danker, F.W., W. Bauer, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3 <sup>rd</sup> ed. Chicago, 1999
BDB	Brown, F., S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago, 1961.
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BVSAWL	Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CJT	<i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i>
Chm	<i>Churchman</i>
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CTJ	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
CurBS	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert

<i>DLNT</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Developments.</i> Edited by Ralph P. Martin, Peter H. Davids. InterVarsity: Leicester, 1997
<i>DNTB</i>	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background.</i> Edited by Craig A. Evans, Stanley E. Porter. InterVarsity: Leicester, 2000.
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
<i>EDNT</i>	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.</i> Edited by H. Balz, G. Schneider. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1990-1993.
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.</i> Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. 2 <sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford, 1910
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
ITC	International theological commentary
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
LNTS	Library of New Testament studies
MHT	Moulton, J. H., W. F. Howard, N. Turner. <i>A Grammar of New Testament Greek.</i> Edinburgh, 1908-76.
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament
NIBCOT	New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis.</i> Edited by W.A. VanGemeren 3 vols. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997.



NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTL	New Testament Library
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review &amp; Expositor</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SBLABib	Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBL SBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Monograph Series
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses</i>
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia post-Biblica
SVTP	Studies in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TLOT</i>	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

## **Ch.1: The Relationship between Hebrews & Deuteronomy**

### **1.1 Introduction & History**

The letter to the Hebrews<sup>1</sup> has been described as "one of the earliest and most successful attempts to define the relation between the Old and New Testaments"<sup>2</sup> and its author similarly portrayed as "more than anyone else, the Old Testament theologian of the New."<sup>3</sup> Any serious analysis of the letter must take account of its exposition and application of the Greek Jewish Scriptures. Whilst its ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ ἀγενεαλόγητος production has generated widespread debate as to its milieu and conceptual background,<sup>4</sup> such speculation has always had to engage with the letter's core Old Testament (OT) material<sup>5</sup> to justify any position adopted. Hebrews' use of the OT is intrinsic to the prevailing worldview in which its readers are invited to participate:

Through its multiple citations from the Greek text of Scripture, its mode of introducing those citations that treat Scripture as a living and spoken word, and its intricate interpretations of Scripture in light of a contemporary experience,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hebrews' genre has engaged scholars for many years. Whilst we will make much of its oral and sermonic character, we receive it in epistolary form, with customary personalised valedictions (13:22-25). Hence we will refer to it primarily as a letter or epistle, not judging Deissman's distinction between the two expressions (cf. Gustav Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), 227-30), but recognising, in modern parlance at least, the terms' synonymy. Using both labels avoids unnecessary and stylistically awkward repetition.

<sup>2</sup> George B. Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CJT* 5 (1959): 45.

<sup>3</sup> D. Moody Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays; Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (ed. James M. Efird; Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972), 61.

<sup>4</sup> The best recent assessment of such issues remains L. D. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought* (SNTSMS 65; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

<sup>5</sup> Scholarly opinion varies as to the appropriate terminology for identifying the Scriptural imagery – 'Hebrew Bible', 'Old Testament', 'Israel's Scriptures' etc. In the interests of consistency, and because Hebrews' itself describes a πρώτη διαθήκη as παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον (8:13), we will henceforth use 'Old Testament' terminology.

A further terminological clarification is also requisite. Whilst the use of gender-specific language will generally be avoided, the textual witness of 11:32 (the masculine participle διηγούμενον) makes the case for male authorship strong. We will therefore use masculine terminology for the author when absolutely necessary.

Hebrews constructs a world for its hearers that is entirely and profoundly scriptural.<sup>6</sup>

Research on the function of the OT in Hebrews has consequently been relatively abundant and space precludes an exhaustive discussion of the material produced.<sup>7</sup> Whilst such categorisation can be somewhat artificial, the dominant drive of OT/Hebrews research has tended towards text-critical and *Vorlage* analysis of the letter's quotations,<sup>8</sup> along with related issues such as the author's exegetical technique<sup>9</sup> and hermeneutical assumptions.<sup>10</sup> More recently, the research scope has

---

<sup>6</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson, "The Scriptural World of Hebrews," *Int* 57 (2003): 247.

<sup>7</sup> For a comprehensive review of recent scholarship see Radu Gheorgita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews* (WUNT 2/160; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003), 7-25; George H. Guthrie, "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research," *Currents in Biblical Research* 1 (2003): 271-94.

<sup>8</sup> Kenneth J. Thomas, "Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *NTS* 11 (1965): 303-25; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001), 98-108; Simon Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Soest, 1961), 17-60; George E. Howard, "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations," *NovT* 10 (1968): 208-16; John C. McCullough, "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews," *NTS* 26 (1980): 363-79; Alan H. Cadwallader, "The Correction of the Text of Hebrews Towards the LXX," *NovT* 34 (1992): 257-92; Peter Katz, "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews," *ZNW* 49 (1958): 213-23; William Leonard, *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament* (London: Vatican Polyglot, 1939); Gert Jacobus Steyn, "A Quest for the Vorlage of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut 32) Quotations in Hebrews," *Neot* 34 (2000): 263-72.

<sup>9</sup> Friedrich Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger* (Biblische Untersuchungen 4; Regensburg: Pustet, 1968); Herbert W. Bateman IV, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage* (American University Studies: Series VII Theology and Religion 193; New York: Peter Lang, 1997); Caird, "Exegetical," 44-51; R. T. France, "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor," *TynBul* 47 (1996): 245-76; Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. Donald H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 161-178; Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 94-133; Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 158-85.

<sup>10</sup> Graham Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics* (SNTSMS 36; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Marcus Barth, "The Old Testament in Hebrews: An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics," in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper* (ed. W. Klassen and G. W. Snyder; London: SCM, 1962), 53-78; Dale F. Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms* (NABPR dissertation series 10; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1994); Stephen Motyer, "The Psalm Quotations of Hebrews 1: A Hermeneutic-Free Zone?" *TynBul* 50 (1999): 3-22; A. T. Hanson, "Hebrews," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 292-302; Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 61-94; Kiwoong Son, *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18-24 as a Hermeneutical Key to the Epistle* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005); Sidney G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Richmond: John Knox, 1965); Steve Stanley, "A New Covenant Hermeneutic: The Use of Scripture in Hebrews 8-10," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 204-06; Francis Charles Synge, *Hebrews and the Scriptures*. (London: SPCK, 1959); James W. Thompson, *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (CBQMS 13; Washington, D.C.:

extended to the specific influence of the LXX,<sup>11</sup> the rhetorical function of the OT,<sup>12</sup> use of familiar OT narratives,<sup>13</sup> and analyses focused upon the letter's (non-divine) OT protagonists.<sup>14</sup>

One potential avenue of inquiry for Hebrews' research is how an individual OT book functions corporately within the letter. The recent publications in the 'New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel' series pursue this book-based approach,<sup>15</sup> and build upon other intertextual studies on Hebrews' use of particular OT books, especially the Psalms corpus.<sup>16</sup> Our thesis sits within this stream of inquiry, though, as we shall suggest below, goes beyond its predecessors in terms of working out the

---

Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982); Ronald Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

<sup>11</sup> Gheorgita, *Role*, 32-231; Martin Karrer, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 335-53.

<sup>12</sup> On Hebrews' general rhetorical qualities, see Michael R. Cosby, *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11: In Light of Example Lists in Antiquity* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988); David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); Barnabas Lindars, "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews," *NTS* 35 (1989): 382-406; Thomas H. Olbricht, "Hebrews as Amplification," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 375-87; Duane F. Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism of Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles since 1978," *CurBS* 5 (1997): 175-207.

<sup>13</sup> Martin Emmrich, "Hebrews 6:4-6 – Again! (A Pneumatological Inquiry)," *WTJ* 65 (2003): 83-95; Peter Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1-4:13," *WTJ* 55 (1993): 255-80; Philip F. Esler, "Collective Memory and Hebrews 11: Outlining a New Investigative Framework," in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity* (ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher; SemeiaSt 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005); Randall C. Gleason, "The Old Testament Background of the Warning in Hebrews 6:4-8," *BSac* 155 (1998): 62-91; Randall C. Gleason, "The Old Testament Background of Rest in Hebrews 3:7-4:11," *BSac* 157 (2000): 281-303; Jon Laansma, *I Will Give You Rest: The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4* (WUNT 2/98; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997); Hermut Löhr, "'Heute, Wenn Ihr Seine Stimme Hört.'" Zur Kunst der Schrifanwendung im Hebräerbrief und in 1 Kor 10," in *Schriftauslegung im Antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum* (ed. Martin Hengel and Hermut Löhr; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994), 226-48; Dave Mathewson, "Reading Heb 6:4-6 in Light of the Old Testament," *WTJ* 61 (1999): 209-25; Verlyn D. Verbrugge, "Towards a New Interpretation of Hebrews 6:4-6," *CTJ* 15 (1980): 61-73; Noel Weeks, "Admonition and Error in Hebrews," *WTJ* 39 (1976): 72-80.

<sup>14</sup> Pamela Michelle Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (SBLDS 156; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Mary Rose D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* (SBLDS 42; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

<sup>15</sup> Thus far in the series: Harold W. Attridge, "The Psalms in Hebrews," in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 197-212; J. Cecil McCullough, "Isaiah in Hebrews," in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 159-73.

<sup>16</sup> For example, Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 96-133.

nature of the interrelationship. We will examine the use of Deuteronomy in the letter to the Hebrews, attempting to discern how the latter's various OT motifs might contribute to a 'Deuteronomic' reading of the letter.

Such a book-based approach might appear anachronistic, as Hebrews itself appears initially uninterested in the precise textual provenance or human 'author' of the cited material. God, Son and the Holy Spirit are rather the dominant Scriptural orators; David is subsequently accredited the quotation of Ps 95:7 in Heb 4:7, but he is only an instrument (ἐν Δαυὶδ λέγων – 4:7) of the Spirit's prior voicing (cf. 3:7). Likewise, the human author of Ps 8 remains anonymous, being merely 'someone somewhere' who penned the psalm's testimony (Heb 2:6; cf. the similar disinterest in 5:6). The absence, however, of a specified origin does not necessarily require that the citation's source is not contingent upon or in service of the prevailing argument. It seems imperative, for example, that Ps 110:1 and 110:4 co-exist in the same parent text, as this permits Hebrews to interpret Melchizedek as a genuine king-priest.<sup>17</sup> It is perfectly possible that the author's choice of OT materials (quotations, allusions, echoes, characters, themes *et al*) are not merely apologetic or coincidental proof texts, but rather corporately reconstruct a familiar OT narrative that serves the author's hortatory purpose.

At first glance, Hebrews and Deuteronomy might seem to make unlikely conversation partners. Hebrews announces the demise of the 'former' or 'old' covenant (Heb 8:13, 10:9) which Deuteronomy, on initial reading perhaps, appears to establish as the rule for life in the land (Deut 4:40, 5:1, 12:1, 29:9). Hebrews' widely acknowledged linguistic excellence is in stark contrast to LXX Deuteronomy's rather unwieldy and harsh Greek rendering, occasioned by its desire to faithfully replicate its Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>18</sup> The NT letter is dominated by priestly and sacrificial language, much of which is drawn from Leviticus rather than Deuteronomy, a text for which priestly discourse and praxis are, at best, only minor elements. However,

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Son, *Zion*, 149: "(I)t is not only the priestly oracle of verse 4 of Psalm 110 but also the kingly oracle of verse 1 of the Psalm that contribute to the superior nature of Jesus' high priesthood in Hebrews."

<sup>18</sup> Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie. 5, Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 33 note that the parts of the text are "rude pour des oreilles grecques." J. W. Wevers, "The Attitude of the Greek Translator Towards His Parent Text," in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift Für Walter Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Herbert Donner, et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 500-501 observes: "Deut is more obsessed by faithfulness to the parent text sometimes to the point of obscurity."

intertextual treatment of two apparently 'foreign' narratives can nonetheless open up profitable lines of inquiry in previously unexpected ways<sup>19</sup> and a number of surface similarities between Hebrews and Deuteronomy invite further comparative analysis. Qumranic expectation of a priestly messiah drew its substance from a Deuteronomic testimonia (Deut 33:8-11 – cf. 4Q175), whilst Hebrews' paradigmatic prologue portrays the Son in terms of the prophet-priest-king trinity of Deut 17:14-18:22 (prophet – 1:1-2; priest – 1:3; king – 1:3).<sup>20</sup> Both texts appeal to past events/history as grounds for action in the present. Both invest the land motif with a soteriological character, and define apostasy in terms of the failure to enter that land. Both are sermonic or homiletic in character and appeal for attention to the spoken word. Both climax in discourses focused around two mountains, with cursing and blessing motifs prominent in each montage. Likewise, each one explicates a covenant that marks the end of the Mosaic era and a consequent change in leadership to a ἡσούς figure.

It is our contention that such surface similarities are actually symptoms of, or signposts to, a Deuteronomic reading of Hebrews. Even a cursory glance at the letter suggests that the Song of Moses (Deut 32) has a particular attraction for Hebrews, as three of its Deuteronomic quotations are sourced from this particular chapter (1:6, 10:30a, 10:30b; cf. Deut 32:43, 35, 36). More detailed exegesis will also reveal echoes of Deut 32 in Heb 2:1 (32:46), 2:5 (32:8-9 LXX), 3:12-19 (32:15, 32:20, 32 *passim*), 4:12 (32:46-47), 6:7 (32:2, especially in rabbinic discourse), 10:23 (32:4) and 10:25 (32:35).

The letter's use of Deuteronomy remains fairly uncharted territory in terms of Hebrews' scholarship. Whilst there has been some analysis of the actual quotations of Deuteronomy within Hebrews,<sup>21</sup> these have attempted primarily to ascertain their *Vorlage*, rather than to construct an overarching Deuteronomic reading of the letter. Works have occasionally dealt with Hebrews' assessment of issues pertinent to

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Seán Freyne, "Reading Hebrews and Revelation Intertextually," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Israel* (ed. Spike Draisma; Kampen, Netherlands: J H Kok, 1989), 83-93, whose comparison of two remarkably different texts yields interesting and fruitful results.

<sup>20</sup> On Deut 18:18-19 within prophet-priest-king messianic thought, see William Horbury, "Monarchy and Messianism in the Greek Pentateuch," in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Michael A. Knibb; BETL 195; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006), 110-15.

<sup>21</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 213-23; Steyn, "Quest," 263-72. Forthcoming in the 'New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel' series is Steyn's chapter on Deuteronomy in Hebrews.

Deuteronomy, such as the wilderness wanderings,<sup>22</sup> the role of the new covenant<sup>23</sup> or the letter's depiction of Moses,<sup>24</sup> but none do so through particularly Deuteronomic lenses.

Several scholars have, however, made guarded remarks about the affinity between the two texts or touched upon their interrelationship. A broad application of Deuteronomic ideology to Hebrews, for example, is made by Robin Nixon:

(T)he author sees the situation of his readers as being parallel to that of the people of the first Exodus. ... (T)he forty years are running out as AD 70 approaches; the people of Israel are to bring upon themselves the curses threatened in an Exodus context in the book of Deuteronomy and they will be dispossessed of their inheritance as the heathen were; the new people of God will then be led by the new Joshua, Jesus, into their spiritual inheritance.<sup>25</sup>

Of Heb 12:15, Peter Rhea Jones opines that "the vivid picture, 'root of bitterness', is taken directly from Deuteronomy 29, along with much else relevant to the concerns of Hebrews," whilst of 13:5, he notes how "with great pastoral sensitivity and mastery of Deuteronomy the author confirmed God's promise of his constant presence."<sup>26</sup> John Proctor likewise avers that "Deuteronomy as a whole is a quarry where Hebrews digs a good deal of information," and tentatively suggests that both texts exhibit contextual and situational parallels in terms of journeying and apostasy.<sup>27</sup> P.C.B. Andriessen notes how Hebrews "s'inspire souvent de LXXDt, soit par des citations, soit par des allusions" and finds such Deuteronomic influence outworked in Hebrews' use of the land motif.<sup>28</sup> In an essay on Deuteronomy's contemporary promise/fulfilment relevance, Gerhard von Rad remarks: "we are astonished how similar Israel's situation before God is to that which the New Testament church found itself.... (W)ith respect to what we have said about the

---

<sup>22</sup> E. Käsemann, *Das Wanderende Gottesvolk* (FRLANT 37; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), 5-58.

<sup>23</sup> Susanne Lehne, *The New Covenant in Hebrews* (JSNTSup 44; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

<sup>24</sup> D'Angelo, *Moses*.

<sup>25</sup> Robin Ernest Nixon, *The Exodus in the New Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1963), 27.

<sup>26</sup> Peter Rhea Jones, "A Superior Life: Hebrews 12:3-13:25," *RevExp* 82 (1985): 394, 400.

<sup>27</sup> John Proctor, "Judgement or Vindication? Deuteronomy 32 in Hebrews 10:30," *TynBul* 55 (2004): 68, 74-75.

<sup>28</sup> P.C.B. Andriessen, "La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de Hé 1:6 et 2:14b-3:2," *NovT* 18 (1976): 295n3.

history of salvation between election and fulfilment, just think of the Letter to the Hebrews!"<sup>29</sup> Dieter Georgi also observes how "(u)nder heavy influence of Deuteronomy, Hebrews understands law most of all as paraenesis."<sup>30</sup>

Probably the most significant examination is contained within John Dunnill's avowedly structuralist assessment of Hebrews.<sup>31</sup> Dunnill remarks upon a number of common symbolic affinities between Hebrews and Deuteronomy (including covenant renewal, sacred time/place, divine encounter) and it will become clear that our thesis benefits from many of his astute observations on their intertextual exchange. He finds a common vision in the two texts, concluding:

(t)he relation between Hebrews and Deuteronomy is ... in each case an attempt to articulate God's call and challenge to his people, not only in an authoritative preaching but through the re-presentation of an event, in the celebration of a divine personal presence and the possibilities which that presence opens up: the renewal of history.<sup>32</sup>

Despite Dunnill's commendable sensitivity to the texts' shared themes, however, his monograph is not a comprehensive assessment on their interrelationship (and never intends to be so). To paraphrase Heb 4:1, it still remains for someone to enter into a full analysis of the function of Deuteronomy in Hebrews.<sup>33</sup>

## **1.2 Deuteronomy as text**

Deuteronomy purports to be the farewell address of Moses, a retelling of the Horeb theophany and its associated stipulations, whilst at the same time expounding further statutes and regulations that compose its central law code. The discourse culminates in a covenant renewal ceremony on the plains of Moab that marks the handover of

---

<sup>29</sup> Gerhard von Rad, "Ancient Word and Living Word: The Preaching of Deuteronomy and Our Preaching," *Int* 15 (1961): 9.

<sup>30</sup> Dieter Georgi, "Hebrews and the Heritage of Paul," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights* (ed. Gabriella Gelardini; Biblical Interpretation Series 75; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 244.

<sup>31</sup> John Dunnill, *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS 75; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

<sup>32</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 134.

<sup>33</sup> Guy Prentiss Waters, *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* (WUNT 2/221; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2006), 250 arrives independently at this conclusion, and ponders whether "there is a discernible pattern to the engagement of Deut 29, 31, and 32 in Hebrews." Our thesis seeks to address his question.



leadership from Moses to Joshua under the auspices of torah and Song. Its status as a pre-eminent text within Second Temple Judaism has been well established<sup>34</sup> and aspects of its significance will be explicated in the following chapter. Lim remarks: "On virtually every page and column of Second Temple Jewish literature, one is able to detect a verbatim citation, *oratio obliqua* or allusion to a Deuteronomic source."<sup>35</sup> Despite such contemporary prominence, or perhaps because of it, some clarification is necessary regarding the parameters and content of what we shall henceforth identify as 'Deuteronomy.' What would a Greek reader like Hebrews' author have understood by it and what text would have been available to him?<sup>36</sup>

Deuteronomy is attested in several major textual streams ((proto-)MT, LXX, (proto-)SamP), and manifests further development and interpretation within targumic and rabbinic traditions. Modern OT scholarship also divides on what is genuinely 'Deuteronomic', variously restricting core Deuteronomy to 12-26<sup>37</sup> or 4:44-30:20.<sup>38</sup> It cannot, therefore, be merely *assumed* that the LXX composed all 34 chapters, and to speak of a precise 'final' or 'canonical' form is both unduly simplistic and contrary to the contrasting textual evidence within Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. Caution is particularly requisite when discussing Deuteronomy's usage in Hebrews, as several

---

<sup>34</sup> Most recently, see Sidnie White Crawford, "Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 140: "Deut was an authoritative text in and of itself, an important book in the creation of texts for study purposes and/or liturgical use, and was used as a base text in the exegetical creation of Rewritten Bible works with claims to their own authority. Deuteronomy may be termed the 'second law' but clearly has attained the first place in Second Temple Judaism." Twenty-nine manuscripts of Deuteronomy have been unearthed in the Judean Desert (26 at Qumran), a volume second in abundance only to the Psalms (numbering 40) – Julie A. Duncan, "Deuteronomy, Book Of," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 198-99.

<sup>35</sup> Timothy H. Lim, "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period," in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark International, forthcoming).

<sup>36</sup> The primary works on Greek Deuteronomy remain Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*; John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995). See also John William Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (MSU 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978); John William Wevers, "The LXX Translator of Deuteronomy," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 57-89. Our discussion of LXX Deuteronomy is heavily indebted to these works.

<sup>37</sup> Stephen B. Chapman, "'The Law and the Words' as a Canonical Formula within the Old Testament," in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 37n64.

<sup>38</sup> Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I, Die Sammelnden und Bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Halle: M.Niemeyer, 1943), 16.

apparently Deuteronomic citations depart from the LXX text evidenced in both A and B traditions.<sup>39</sup> With the book's repetitive and formulaic style, Wevers notes an expansionistic tendency within its transmission process and hence his critical edition generally favours shorter readings.<sup>40</sup>

One may, however, still speak confidently about the broad contours of Greek Deuteronomy, even if uncertainties remain regarding finer points of textual precision. The Qumran evidence, for example, attests all 34 chapters, albeit across a number of scrolls,<sup>41</sup> and, as we shall see, the Qumranic readings support several LXX variant (i.e. non-MT) readings.<sup>42</sup> More significantly, the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE Greek MS P. Fouad 848 attests chapters 17-33 in their received canonical order, suggesting that putatively non-Deuteronomic material, especially chs. 31-33, would have formed part of Hebrews' *textus receptus*.<sup>43</sup> Our working text will be Wevers' Göttingen edition, whose content comprises all 34 chapters,<sup>44</sup> and we will view Deut 1-34 as complete entity, not in negation of its transmission history, but rather recognising that this was the textual form available to the NT writers.<sup>45</sup>

The effects of Deuteronomy's transmission history, though, are not irrelevant to our inquiry. In both the Greek and MT traditions, the redactional process is not seamless; differing voices continue to speak within the discourse, and are not silenced for the attentive reader, testifying instead to a history of reflection and

---

<sup>39</sup> See Katz, "Quotations," 213-23.

<sup>40</sup> See Wevers' summation of the characteristically shorter P. Fouad 848 – Wevers, *History*, 64-85. Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 199-200 observes the same expansionistic trend in the Qumran Deuteronomic material, venturing that the phenomenon is more marked in the LXX/Qumran texts than in the proto-Masoretic and proto-Samaritan traditions. Crawford, "Reading," 130 notes that most variants derive from scribal error: "Deuteronomy does not exist in two variant literary traditions, as does, for example, Jeremiah."

<sup>41</sup> Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 145.

<sup>42</sup> Several fragments of Greek Deuteronomy were also found at Qumran (4QLXXDeut) – see Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. 4, Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 195-97. The fragments contribute little text-critically (Deut 11:4 is the only identified text), but nonetheless attest the existence and usage of LXX Deuteronomy in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE. Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 199-200 observes that 4QDeut<sup>h</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> and 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> also reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek tradition.

<sup>43</sup> Wevers, *History*, 64.

<sup>44</sup> John William Wevers, *Deuterionomium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977). We will use his versification of the text, notably in Deut 29, where he follows EVV division against MT and Rahlfs.

<sup>45</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 19 locate its date to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE.

retrospection. Lim observes that the location of the discourse as *across* the Jordan (1:5; also 1:1) implies a west Jordan perspective to the account; from the outset, the eastern pre-conquest context, however dominant narrative-wise, is not the only lens through which the events are to be comprehended. This will be of interest to us in discussing Deuteronomy's own (muted) assessment of life in the land. Post-exilic spectacles are similarly evidenced by the LXX's specific reference to the punishment of the Diaspora (ἐν διασπορᾷ – 28:25; cf. 30:4). Whilst LXX Deuteronomy's implied readers are situated on the Moabite plain, its actual audience hears the text from a post-exilic perspective of Hellenistic dispersion.

Yet recognition of the text's various redactional and perspectival layers should not detract from the narrative's dominant pre-entry perspective, however 'fictitious' this might be. The text is primarily a "temps d'arrêt" for Israel in her exodus narrative, a time of reflecting on the past, giving new laws and passing leadership onto Joshua against the celebration of the Moab covenant.<sup>46</sup> Although they detail a number of interesting qualitative and quantitative distinctions between the LXX and the Hebrew text, Dogniez and Harl concur that "le traducteur recevait le texte sous la forme d'un livre en son édition finale, enchaîné de façon continue et logique; pour lui tout prenait sens dans cette unité littéraire."<sup>47</sup> Hence when we speak of the 'Deuteronomic posture,' the position adopted is the Moab, pre-entry handover moment of the discourse; the implied audience stand at the threshold of entry into the land and await the prophesied blessing or curse which would subsequently accompany life within it.<sup>48</sup>

LXX Deuteronomy remains a translation, and therefore an interpretation of the Hebrew original.<sup>49</sup> It is a 'text' in its own right. Although the translator was

---

<sup>46</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 19-20.

<sup>47</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 21. They also propose that the translator knew of, and sought to preserve, the eminent sacral role Deuteronomy held in contemporary Judaism (20). See also Wevers, *Notes*, x-xii

<sup>48</sup> In using the term *Deuteronomic*, we are scoping out reference to 'Deuteronomistic,' and the connotations of Martin Noth's Deuteronomistic History (Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche*). By 'Deuteronomist,' we mean the person(s) responsible for the form of (LXX) Deuteronomy available to Hebrews – and no more. We will restrict our investigation solely to Deuteronomy, without recourse to the Joshua-Kings discourse, since LXX Deuteronomy does not link itself to the former prophets; rather, the translator views the text as closing the Pentateuch – cf. Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 75.

<sup>49</sup> Lim, "Deuteronomy."

generally conservative in regards to his Hebrew *Vorlage*,<sup>50</sup> preserving a somewhat 'un-Greek' word order, there are inevitably ways in which the Greek text exhibits characteristic nuance. It furnishes its own narrative which, whilst fundamentally still the familiar Jewish story, permits interpretation not available from the Hebrew text.<sup>51</sup> The text's title – δευτερονόμιον as opposed to the Hebrew דְּבָרִים – is the case in point. Although derivative from a mistranslation of Deut 17:18,<sup>52</sup> it does seem to have been one label by which the book was identified in its Greek form. The δευτερονόμιον that Joshua wrote (Josh 8:32(9:2)) on Mount Ebal is the lawcode received from Moses (νόμον Μωϋσῆ) and although not his sole appellation for the text,<sup>53</sup> Philo does refer to it as δευτερονόμιον (*Leg* 3.174, *Deus* 50).

The translational misnaming opens further possibilities for the book's reception and interpretation and, for the LXX at least, "devient ainsi la clé du livre."<sup>54</sup> Rather than being דְּבָרִים delivered by Moses on the Moab plain, Δευτερονόμιον becomes a second law,<sup>55</sup> distinct from, or even counter to, its Exodus-Numbers predecessor.<sup>56</sup> This secondariness is subsequently exploited in early Christianity for apologetic reasons,<sup>57</sup> but the translational inaccuracy still befits

---

<sup>50</sup> Wevers, "Attitude," 498-505; Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 29-30. The latter use the term "decalqué" to describe its attention to detail.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Gheorgita, *Role*, esp. 225-31.

<sup>52</sup> The MT reads מִלְּשֹׁנָה הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת, literally and contextually 'the copy of this law', i.e. the law code commencing in Deut 12. The meaning of מִלְּשֹׁנָה is ambiguous and may be rendered as both 'copy' and 'second'; the translator understands the latter rather than the former and coins a neologism – δευτερονόμιον. The sense of the demonstrative pronoun also changes: 'a copy of this law' becomes 'this second law.'

<sup>53</sup> Alternative titles include νομοθεσίας (*Migr.* 182), παραινέσεις (*Spec.* 4.131), προτρεπτικοῖς (*Agr.* 78, 172, possibly *Fug.* 170), ἔπινομίδι (*Her.* 162, 250, *Spec.* 4.160). Such appellatory differences demonstrate both the diversity of material within Deuteronomy (legal and paraenetic) and the different conceptions of the book as denoted by the respective titles. ἔπινομίδι implies an "addition to a law, or appendix" (LSJ), a different, more supplementary, slant than that conveyed by δευτερονόμιον.

<sup>54</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 22.

<sup>55</sup> LSJ *loc. cit.*: 'second or repeated law'.

<sup>56</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 289-90.

<sup>57</sup> This is briefly discussed in Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 27-28. Irenaeus recounts Moses giving a "second law" to his people, along with a "new legislation" (*Epid.* 28), and Origen likewise proposes that the giving of the "second legislation" to Joshua brought an end to the first law, thereby prefiguring the "second" brought in by Christ (*Princ.* 3.12). He also finds precedent in Josh 8:32 for Jesus giving a "second law" in Matt 5.

the overall disposition of the text.<sup>58</sup> Deuteronomy opens with Horeb left behind (1:6) and marks a new stage in Israel's journey towards the promised land; a Moab covenant law code is given 'in addition' to the Horeb disposition (29:1).<sup>59</sup> The label 'second' also opens up the possibility of intertextual connection with Hebrews' own discussion of the requisite 'secondness' of the new covenant in relation to the former dispensation (8:7, 8:13, 9:1, 9:15, 9:18, 10:9).

### **1.3 Methodology/Intertextuality**

Our approach follows George Guthrie's text-linguistic analysis of Hebrews' structure, which takes account of the letter's two distinctive strands of thought, doctrinal and hortatory.<sup>60</sup> Whilst the strands are intertwined to fulfil the author's overall communicatory purposes, Guthrie's proposal justifies treating both sections as distinct elements with their own trajectory through the letter.<sup>61</sup> The OT background of the doctrinal passages has been well researched and understood predominantly in terms of exegesis of the Psalms,<sup>62</sup> coupled with the Jeremiah new covenant. The hortatory passages, however, have received less attention; although studies of individual paraenetic passages do exist,<sup>63</sup> particularly absent has been any attempt to unearth a broader Scriptural narrative operating throughout the letter's hortatory

---

<sup>58</sup> Deuteronomy "is an apt designation of the character, if not also the genre, of the book as the second law that God covenanted with Israel on the plains of Moab" – Lim, "Deuteronomy." Similarly S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), i: "Although based upon a grammatical error, the name is not an inappropriate one; for Deuteronomy ... does embody the terms of a second legislative covenant."

<sup>59</sup> See 4.1.3.

<sup>60</sup> George H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (NovTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1994), passim, esp. 139-45. Guthrie was scarcely the first to distinguish the two streams, but his analysis gives them internal cohesion and progression.

<sup>61</sup> Cynthia Long Westfall, *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning* (LNTS 297; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 18-20 criticizes Guthrie for overstating the distinction and jeopardising the letter's unity. Our concern, however, is less the manner of their connection, but rather to recognize the independent integrity of the paraenetic discourse.

<sup>62</sup> B.F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950), 473; Longenecker, *Biblical*, 167. See also Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 95-133.

<sup>63</sup> *Inter alia* N. Clayton Croy, *Endurance in Suffering: Hebrews 12:1-13 in its Rhetorical, Religious, and Philosophical Context* (SNTSMS 98; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Laansma, *Rest*; Juliana Casey, "Eschatology in Heb. 12:14-29: An Exegetical Study" (PhD diss., Catholic University of Leuven, 1977).

strand.<sup>64</sup> If Scriptural exposition is intrinsic to the author's understanding of the Son's high priestly sacrifice, then it seems at least possible that a similarly Scriptural perspective underpins his paraenetic approach. It is this broader interpretative task that forms the context for our present study, as we seek to establish the nature of any Deuteronomic backdrop to the letter. Reference to the doctrinal sections of the letter will be sporadically necessary, but our study will focus primarily upon the hortatory sections, treating them as a self-standing, distinct entity in their own right.<sup>65</sup>

Our attention will likewise concentrate upon the paraenetic elements of Deuteronomy (chs. 1-11, 27-34), with correspondingly less attention paid to the law code itself. Anticipating somewhat the outcome of the research, the vast majority of connections between the two texts are found within their respective hortatory material, with little appeal to the Deuteronomic legal discourse. Any association is paraenetic, not doctrinal. Furthermore, Hebrews' insistence on a new covenant, and the demise of its predecessor, immediately draws some disjuncture between the two texts, implicitly envisaging a 'legal' framework ontologically different from that of Deut 12-26. Rather than being 'done' or 'taught' (Heb 8:13), laws will be written on human minds and hearts (Heb 8:10, 10:16; cf. Deut 30:6).

Isolating the Deuteronomic paraenesis from the legal corpus might be justified on modern source critical grounds, but it receives similar warrant from contemporary literature. The Qumranic excerpted texts of Deuteronomy consistently omit legislative material, but still apparently possessed an important didactic or liturgical function within the community.<sup>66</sup> The Testament of Moses functions against the backdrop of Deut 31-34, and likewise has little concern for the precise content of the law code. 4QMMT utilises covenantal paraenesis drawn from Deut 30:1-2, 4:29-30, but applies it to halakhic legislation drawn predominantly from Leviticus, and only minimally from Deut 12-26. It appears that Deuteronomic

---

<sup>64</sup> Käsemann, *Gottesvolk* remains an important contribution, but its emphasis upon the letter's Gnostic backdrop colours its significance.

<sup>65</sup> This is particularly pertinent if, as William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8: Hebrews 9-13* (WBC 47A-47B; 2 vols.; Dallas: Word, 1991), contends, "paraenesis holds the various sections of discourse together as a unified whole. The dominant motif in Hebrews is paraenetic." If exhortation is primary in the letter, and if the OT is seminal to its argument, some attempt to unearth an OT backdrop to the paraenesis would seem a worthwhile exercise. Timothy A. Lenchak, *"Choose Life!" A Rhetorical-Critical Investigation of Deuteronomy 28,69 - 30,20* (AnBib 129; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993), 5-6 also proposes that paraenesis is the most important element within Deuteronomy.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Julie A. Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 43-62.

paraenetic material has a life of its own distinct from the legal corpus, and may be engaged without recourse to the latter.

Some comment must also be made on our broader methodology. OT in the NT has expanded as a discourse in recent years, and our thesis will engage some of the questions raised by that discourse (faithfulness to original authorial intent, respect for context, application of non-cited passages).<sup>67</sup> One methodological aspect that does require some initial clarification, however, is our use of intertextuality, as the term tends to be used with some imprecision and disregard for the literary critical circles in which it was coined.<sup>68</sup> Its entry into biblical studies has expanded the term's scope and in recognition of this, Moyise ascribes it a broad definition: it "is best used as an 'umbrella' term for the complex interactions that exist between 'texts.'"<sup>69</sup> He identifies three types of intertextual methodology evidenced within the discipline ("echo," "dialogical" and "postmodern"),<sup>70</sup> the first two of which are germane to our approach. "Echo" incorporates the familiar OT in the NT categories of quotation and allusion, how the NT text utilises motifs, language or material ostensibly borrowed from the antecedent OT text. Such citation of Deuteronomy in Hebrews will form the backbone of our inquiry. "Dialogical" intertextuality reflects on how the semantic sense of the OT lemma changes through participation in the NT text; it is not just about importing the original meaning into the new text, but also viewing how/if the original is changed in the process. Again, this will be of concern to us; does Hebrews' use of Deuteronomy reflect or even inculcate a fresh or altered understanding of its source text?<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> For an introduction to the divergent views on such issues, see the collection of essays in G. K. Beale, *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 80-88.

<sup>69</sup> Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North* (ed. Steve Moyise; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 41.

<sup>70</sup> Moyise, "Intertextuality," 14-41.

<sup>71</sup> Hebrews 3:7-4:11 would appear to be a case in point. The heavenly *κατάπαυσις* is viewed in similar terms to the Canaan rest but is shown to be greater or more extensive than Canaan. In so doing, Heb 4:8 reinterprets the Deuteronomic perspective on Canaan and opens up the possibility that Deuteronomic rest should be read in a different light.

Gail O'Day identifies similar plurality within biblical studies' adoption of intertextual methodology. She differentiates between historical-critical approaches produced in the first half of the twentieth century that attended to OT usage in relation to authorial intent, and more recent approaches that focus on the reinterpretation of texts along a continuum within a tradition. Whereas the former focused upon "prophecy/fulfilment and apologetic motives," the latter "starts with a received text and moves forward to subsequent interpretations of it."<sup>72</sup> Our approach will attempt to embrace both aspects, suggesting that, for Hebrews at least, there is good reason to see them as complementary rather than antithetical. It is difficult to ignore the typological fulfilment discourse that pervades Hebrews' argument, and we will consider how its author uses Deuteronomy to source, sustain and construct its paraenesis. It will also be shown, however, particularly in the final chapter, that the engagement is genuinely intertextual; Hebrews' interface with Deuteronomy participates in a broader debate within Jewish tradition on the nature and outworking of Israel's story.

In summary, our approach is intertextual in a broad, though not unlimited, sense. We will not engage the "postmodern" issues that (rightly) stress the ideological perspectives which impose on any reading of the text. Our scope is limited only to that exchange between the textual worlds created by Deuteronomy and Hebrews. We are nonetheless concerned to analyse the exchange in as wide a fashion as possible, using the definition proposed by Watson *et al*, that intertextuality denotes "a text's representation of, reference to and use of phenomena in the world outside the text being interpreted."<sup>73</sup> The 'phenomena' under discussion will include familiar categories of quotations and allusions, but will extend to Hebrews' engagement with themes, motifs, rhetoric and situations borrowed from the antecedent text.

Furthermore, we are interested in Deuteronomy for its own sake, rather than just Hebrews' usage of it as a mine of convenient proof texts. The interplay between the two books is genuinely reciprocal; although, for heuristic purposes, we will start with the Hebrews text and work backwards, we will also have in view how

---

<sup>72</sup> Gail O'Day, "Intertextuality," 546-48.

<sup>73</sup> Duane Frederick Watson, *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 2.



Deuteronomy's narrative (and especially chs. 28-34) proves receptive to engagement over Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* and continues to work forward within the NT text.<sup>74</sup> Such a forward-orientated approach to the OT seems commensurate with Hebrews itself, as the author attempts to make sense of the Scriptures in the light of the new revelation.<sup>75</sup> Hebrews 11, for example, exhibits a progressive dynamic as it rehearses elements of Israel's history; it climaxes in 11:39-40, but in a conclusion now shared with the new covenant faithful. Vos observes of Heb 4:2, that it reads 'we as well as they', not 'they as well as we';<sup>76</sup> apropos of his observation, and in agreement with him, Hebrews appears to theorize upon the OT situation first and then try to make sense of it in terms of the new covenant revelation.

#### **1.4 Thesis Outline**

Chapter 2 anticipates the material covered in subsequent chapters by focusing upon the Song of Moses. In view of Hebrews' frequent appeal to the Song, we will examine the text's context, message and usage in the Second Temple era.

Chapter 3 turns attention to Hebrews itself, and focuses upon its textual affinities with Deuteronomy. Four types of interface will be analysed: quotations, strong allusions, echoes and narrative affiliations. The first three types, although familiar criteria from other OT in the NT works,<sup>77</sup> require some further definition. The fourth, though less common, is more straightforward; for our purposes, narrative affiliations are those instances in which Hebrews recalls features of the Deuteronomic narrative, conveying familiarity with an episode but without formal lexical reproduction.

Distinguishing between quotations, allusions and echoes can be a difficult and somewhat subjective exercise, as the criteria by which to categorize the

---

<sup>74</sup> Hence our methodology differs from the work of, for example, C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 1-27 and Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961), 251-86. The former worked backward from the kerygma, whilst the latter espouses an apologetic approach to the OT text.

<sup>75</sup> This seems broadly conversant with the assessment of Hebrews' OT exegesis in Caird, "Exegetical," 44-51.

<sup>76</sup> Geerhardus Vos, "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke," *Princeton Theological Review* xiv (1916): 19.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Moyise, *Old*, 5-6.

respective elements lacks substantial consensus.<sup>78</sup> Quotations are normally recognized by the presence of an introductory formula (IF) that demarks or separates the cited text from the author's own words. Hebrews characteristically introduces quotations with variant forms of λέγω, and frequently interprets the citation as direct divine speech.<sup>79</sup> Despite this accepted IF criteria, however, the different quotation counts evinced by commentators testifies to a lack of clarity in determining the existence (or otherwise) of a quotation.<sup>80</sup> Several grey areas emerge: 10:37-38 is a lengthy citation whose subsequent explication makes it sound like a quotation, yet it lacks the typical IF preface. Conversely, Heb 8:5 and 12:21 possess the λέγω IF and therefore qualify as quotations, but their 'spokenness' is essentially narrativ and humanly-voiced, and neither quotation receives further exposition. Our definition of quotation requires the IF, but broadens its scope to include any phrase that introduces the antecedent text more or less verbatim from its original form; ἔτι γὰρ (10:37) and καὶ γὰρ (12:29) thus qualify as IFs introducing formal quotations.

Allusions lack the directive IF, and possess some flexibility in word order compared to the source lemma. Because of their often-impressive verbal similarity with the source text, and in order to emphasize the distinction from mere 'echoes', we will speak of 'strong allusions' rather than just allusions *per se*. Guthrie's definition of a (strong) allusion is apposite: "an overt weaving of at least a phrase from the antecedent text into the author's own language, without a formal marking of that language as set apart from the author's own words."<sup>81</sup>

Defining echoes is more complex and some element of subjectivity is inevitable in their identification. Hays lists seven criteria for assessing an echo's presence (availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical

---

<sup>78</sup> So Porter, "Use," 80-88.

<sup>79</sup> On the hermeneutical differences between Hebrews' use of quotations and allusions, see Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 90-133.

<sup>80</sup> Total quotations cited include 36 – George Guthrie, "Old Testament in Hebrews," *DLNT* 841-850; Ceslas Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Gabalda, 1953), 1.331). 29 – Thomas, "Citations," 303; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 469-70. 35 – Howard, "Hebrews," 211; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 37; Lane, *Hebrews*, cxvi-cxvii; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 116. 38 – Longenecker, *Biblical*, 165-66. 37 – UBS<sup>4</sup>; Robert Galveston Bratcher, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (3; London: 1967), 57-67. Variations occur according to, for example, whether 10:30 is counted as one or two citations.

<sup>81</sup> Guthrie, "Recent," 273.

plausibility, history of interpretation and satisfaction)<sup>82</sup> and his categories provide a useful framework for our analysis. We will not formulaically apply each individual test to the respective echoes (and neither, in the interests of avoiding monotony, does Hays);<sup>83</sup> moreover, because our attention is focused solely on Deuteronomy, any justification premised upon the first three criteria would be somewhat self-fulfilling. Instead, we will assess each echo upon the latter four tests, paying particular attention to the echo's explanatory power; that is, does the echo fit within the broader context of the letter's argument (thematic coherence) in a contextually appropriate manner (historical plausibility) acknowledged by others (history of interpretation) that enriches the argument being made (satisfaction)? In so doing, we will seek to demonstrate that the respective texts exhibit at least some of the following criteria: "common vocabulary, common word order, common theme(s), similar imagery, similar structure, (and) similar circumstance(s)."<sup>84</sup>

Most intertextual studies on Hebrews are driven by analysis of textual links, but in terms of Deuteronomy at least, attention solely to verbal affiliation somewhat impoverishes our understanding of the texts' interrelationship. We concur with Lim's assertion that "the study of quotations is a useful and illuminating exercise, but it hardly exhausts the influence of Deuteronomy on the New Testament and other Jewish writers of the Second Temple Period."<sup>85</sup> The next two chapters engage further, non-citational links between the two texts. Chapter 4 examines those themes (covenant, blessing/curse, land) that have a common significance for both texts, and assesses how they connect the two discourses. We will identify motifs which might otherwise be labelled as echoes or allusions and therefore be discussed in the previous chapter. However, for cumulative and heuristic effect, we will group them together under these three specified themes.

Chapter 5 examines how the texts can be profitably compared for their rhetorical effect and investigates the extent to which Hebrews echoes Deuteronomy's

---

<sup>82</sup> Richard Hays, *Echoes of the Scriptures in the Writings of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29-32. For recent discussion on identifying Scriptural allusions and/or echoes, see Dale C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 9-14; Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 41-55.

<sup>83</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 32.

<sup>84</sup> Allison, *Intertextual*, 11.

<sup>85</sup> Lim, "Deuteronomy."

narrative posture. Hebrews' in-depth use of the LXX suggests that the author did indeed anticipate an informed audience,<sup>86</sup> and our analysis of echoes reflects this, but critics of intertextual studies have occasionally mused as to whether subtle textual echoes would necessarily have been comprehended by an audience unversed in the nuances of the OT.<sup>87</sup> This chapter will therefore be as much *internarrative* as *intertextual*. It will focus on high-level, symbolic affinities, rather than particular lexical correspondences, and assumes that an appeal to the broad land/eisodus ideology of Deuteronomy would have been perceptible even for a moderately informed audience.<sup>88</sup>

Chapter 6 shifts intertextual tack. Rather than treating the Hebrews-Deuteronomy relationship in isolation, it considers the broader milieu in which their exchange might function and the degree to which a Deuteronomic intertextual discourse would have contemporary pertinence. It also considers how Hebrews might be said to 're-present' Deuteronomy, or at least be a candidate for re-presentation in its own right.

With introductory and methodological remarks made, our attention in the next chapter now turns to Deuteronomy and its use within Second Temple society.

---

<sup>86</sup> Johnson, "Scriptural," 239: "The author's liberal use of citation and allusion suggests a confidence that the composition's readers share some degree of that competence."

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 39-60.

<sup>88</sup> Christopher M. Tuckett, "Paul, Scripture and Ethics: Some Reflections," *NTS* 46 (2000): 403-24 expresses reservations over the detailed textual awareness demanded by Hays' intertextual methodology. Yet he concedes: "the events associated with the Exodus, including the giving of the Law at Sinai as well as the events of the wilderness wanderings as recounted in the Pentateuch, would be easily recalled and evoked in different contexts" (405).

## **Ch.2: The Text and Function of the Song of Moses**

### **2.1 Deuteronomy in Second Temple Judaism**

As explained in the previous chapter, our methodology begins by seeking to understand Deuteronomy first for its own sake. This would normally require some detailed exegetical investigation and discussion of the text's function within the Second Temple period. The scale, however, of such a survey would prohibit any subsequent analysis of the text's function in Hebrews,<sup>1</sup> and we will instead concentrate upon Deut 32, labelled the 'Greater Song of Moses' by Philo (*Leg* 3.105) and a prime candidate for a more focused assessment of Deuteronomy's usage. This is not to silence other important voices in the Deuteronomic choir, but rather to acknowledge that the Song captures the spirit of Deuteronomy as Moses' swansong, a text preached at the threshold of entry into the land, the avowed perspective of the book from its outset (Deut 1:1-5). Furthermore, in anticipation of our subsequent analysis, Hebrews' widespread usage of Deut 32 merits particular attention to the Song over and above other parts of Deuteronomy. Conversely, Hebrews seems broadly disinterested in the content of the Deuteronomic law book (Deut 12-26),<sup>2</sup> and this removes the need for any detailed analysis of the legislative material.

The Song (*Ha'azinu*)<sup>3</sup> also exists, both textually and functionally, as a distinct unit outside of Deuteronomy. Its 'separateness' is attested both in the Odes corpus (Odes 2) and 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> (which contained only Deut 32:1-43);<sup>4</sup> rabbinic exposition of *Ha'azinu* likewise characterizes it as a discrete, self-standing entity.<sup>5</sup> It has received abundant attention from scholars,<sup>6</sup> particularly focused upon its provenance, date and

---

<sup>1</sup> Overview studies do exist: cf. Lim, "Deuteronomy"; Crawford, "Reading," 128-40.

<sup>2</sup> The sole reference to it (Deut 17:6; cf. Heb 10:28) occurs only to relativize the law code.

<sup>3</sup> Deuteronomy 32 is commonly identified by its opening exhortation יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמָעַל (32:1), and we will use this appellation for convenient reference. Although primarily interested in the LXX form, we will engage with both Hebrew and Greek textual traditions, for analysis of both streams highlights the Song's ambiguities.

<sup>4</sup> See Eugene Charles Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4. V 9, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 137-42.

<sup>5</sup> Herbert W. Basser, *In the Margins of the Midrash: Sifre Ha'azinu Texts, Commentaries, and Reflections* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 11; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 67.

<sup>6</sup> Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (WBC 6b; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 785: "no text within Deuteronomy has received more attention through the years than the Song of Moses

genre. Our analysis will attend more to issues of its interpretation within Deuteronomy itself and the Song's usage within broader Judaism. In our subsequent chapters, it will be important to ascertain whether Hebrews employs the Song within its Deuteronomic milieu or in a separate context derivative from its independent hymnic status. We will examine its literary context within Deuteronomy (particularly Deut 31), before moving on to a discussion of issues raised within its scholarship. After analysing the text of the Song in more detail, paying close attention to its ambiguities and questions of Israel's vindication, we will then turn to its usage beyond canonical Deuteronomy, in both Second Temple and early Christian texts and praxis.

## **2.2 The Form and Use of the Song of Moses**

### **2.2.1 The Song of Moses in Deuteronomy**

There is good reason to concur that, rather than being an isolated psalm or appendix tagged onto the book's primary material,<sup>7</sup> Deut 32 instead opens a window onto other parts of Deuteronomy, setting forth a succinct summary of much of the book's ethos and message. The Song's uniqueness and particularity have occasioned its treatment as a separate unit, and differences remain between chapter 32 and the rest of the book,<sup>8</sup> but it nonetheless exhibits many core Deuteronomic themes such as YHWH's

---

(32:1-43), from ancient scribes who copied it to modern critical scholars who ponder its structure and meaning."

<sup>7</sup> The label 'appendix' is often applied to chs. 31-34. E. Talstra, "Deuteronomy 31: Confusion or Conclusion? The Story of Moses' Threefold Succession," in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 88-95 challenges this designation and demonstrates how one's view of the 'original' Deuteronomy dictates one's assessment of the book's final chapters. He maintains: "a literary approach that *starts* from assumptions about the most original parts of a literary work loses its capacity to guide the reader through the book as a whole" (87). This negates the value of such chapters: "their function with respect to the book of Deuteronomy as a complete composition is not discussed since the label 'Appendix' hardly allows for such a possibility" (90).

From our perspective, chapters 31-34 (and particularly 32) are not an appendix, but a culmination or summary of prior material; they "seek to give a final interpretation to the entire book and for that reason they cannot be dismissed as a secondary work" (Talstra, "Deuteronomy," 102). They signal the climax of Moses' handover, stating the law's central import for life in the land; they look forward where Deut 1-11 looks backwards; they are an intrinsic part of the book's concentric structure. If Deuteronomy had ended at 30:20, it would be a very different text.

<sup>8</sup> For differences between the Song and the rest of Deuteronomy, see Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy: Devarim* (JPSTC; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 510-11; J. Gordon McConville, *Deuteronomy* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary 5; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 461. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 348 points out that the Song has at least 14 *hapax legomena*.

supremacy, Israel's election and apostasy, and the inadequacy of Gentile deities. It has been aptly described as a "compendium of Deuteronomic ideology"<sup>9</sup> and as a song that "contains all of Torah's principles."<sup>10</sup> It "provides a hermeneutical key by which to understand the Mosaic law in an age of disobedience,"<sup>11</sup> and proffers "a summary of Deuteronomic themes in memorable form."<sup>12</sup> Labuschagne likewise describes it as the "*grande finale* of Moses' charges"<sup>13</sup> and similar views of the song's significance are to be found in the work of Weinfeld,<sup>14</sup> Millar,<sup>15</sup> and Wright.<sup>16</sup> Nigosian further suggests that the "poem offers the orthodox Deuteronomic economy of blessings and curses,"<sup>17</sup> whilst Kline, in accordance with his overall thesis of the treaty framework of Deuteronomy, concurs: "in its general structure, this poetic song follows the pattern of the Deuteronomic treaty."<sup>18</sup> Its familiarity with broad

---

<sup>9</sup> R. A. Carlson, *David, the Chosen King: A Tradition-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel* (Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964), 237; he later adds – "the Deuteronomic character of Deut 31-32:44 is thus unmistakable" (243).

<sup>10</sup> Ibn Falaquera's 'Book of the Seekers', quoted in James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 186. Irenaeus speaks of Moses' delivering the song as "a recapitulation of the whole law" – *Her.* 4.2.1.

<sup>11</sup> Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM, 1979), 220.

<sup>12</sup> James W. Watts, *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative* (JSOTSup 139; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 80.

<sup>13</sup> C. J. Labuschagne, "The Song of Moses: Its Framework and Structure," in *De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus Van Selms* (ed. I. H. Eybers et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 92.

<sup>14</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 10n2: "Ideologically the Song has great influence on Deuteronomy."

<sup>15</sup> J. Gary Millar, "'A Faithful God Who Does No Wrong': History, Theology and Reliability in Deuteronomy," in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture* (ed. Paul Helm and Carl R. Trueman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 16: "All the important Deuteronomic elements are present: the central role of God's words (vv1-2), his actions in history (vv. 10-14), the inevitability of those who rebel to experience the 'curse' (v36-38), and even the willingness of God to come to meet the deepest need of his people (v39)."

<sup>16</sup> George Ernest Wright, "Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage; Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson; New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 60: "The very theme of the Deuteronomistic history is the *rib*."

<sup>17</sup> Solomon A. Nigosian, "The Song of Moses (Dt 32): A Structural Analysis," *ETL* 72 (1996): 13.

<sup>18</sup> Meredith G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy - Studies and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 138. He also suggests the 'Song of Witness' functions testimonially, fulfilling the standard role of witness to a treaty (35). Watts, *Psalm*, 75-76 argues that the Song and subsequent Blessing of Moses cause Deuteronomy to "break with the treaty form," but the psalm's presence may actually reflect artistry within the genre, rather than slavish adherence to it. Although the Song does not mention διαθήκη, its singing may testify to Israel's assent and binding to the covenant – so Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 376.

Deuteronomic themes occasioned the suggestion that the Song was the law book found during Josiah's reign,<sup>19</sup> a status historically ascribed to Deuteronomy itself.<sup>20</sup>

Scholars do not arbitrarily impose this perspective upon the Song; it is the verdict of Deuteronomy itself. Although delivered to Israel by Moses, the Song is assigned divine provenance as the *ipsissima verba* of YHWH himself and implicitly assumes significance beyond the prior speeches of Moses. In terms of structure, Labuschagne argues that the Song occupies the pre-eminent central position in a sevenfold menorah structure of chs. 31-34 and is the primary element in that unit.<sup>21</sup> On a wider basis, Levenson has argued that the Song is the text for which the 'exilic frame' of Deuteronomy (chs. 4, 29-31) is the sermon.<sup>22</sup>

Deuteronomy 32 also reflects or recapitulates themes from earlier in the text. YHWH's control of life and death (32:39) echoes the life/death decision articulated in 30:11-20. The scale of the punishment of 32:19-25 recalls the curses articulated in Deut 28:15-68 and, as such, the Song may function to exegete those curses and the context in which they may appear. The heavenly assembly language of 32:8-9 echoes that of Deut 4:19, 29:24-25,<sup>23</sup> whilst the election of Israel (32:8-9) has precedence in Deut 4:20. The appeal to remember (32:7) is reminiscent of prior exhortations to recollect the days of old (4:32),<sup>24</sup> as well as the exodus/wilderness experiences and YHWH's leading of them (5:15, 7:18, 8:2 *et al*). The characteristic faithlessness of Israel (32:5-6, 15-18) echoes the golden calf episode (9:7-29), particularly the appeal to YHWH's reputation and standing such that he might restrain himself from punishing Israel (9:26-29; cf. Deut 32:26-27). The summoning of heaven and earth as witnesses of Israel's imminent apostasy (4:26) is recapitulated in 32:1, and, more broadly, the theme of Israel's faithlessness (32:4-6) reiterates the

---

<sup>19</sup> Jack R. Lundbom, "Lawbook of the Josianic Reform," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 293-302. This suggestion, however, remains purely speculative.

<sup>20</sup> Classically formulated by De Wette, but also suggested by *inter alia* Athanasius and Jerome – see Ernest W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967), 1.

<sup>21</sup> C. J. Labuschagne, "The Setting of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy," in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 111-29. He omits chapter 33, which he casts as a late insertion.

<sup>22</sup> Jon D. Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?" *HTR* 68 (1975): 217.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Patrick W. Skehan, "Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (Deut 32:1-43)," *CBQ* 13 (1951): 154-55.

<sup>24</sup> Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic*, 10n2; he also notes the similarities between 32:11/1:31 and 32:13-18/8:11-18.



formative historical prologue (Deut 1-3). Even if, as most scholars assert, the Song is a late interpolation into Deuteronomy,<sup>25</sup> it is an interpolation that is remarkably commensurate with the material to which it has been added.<sup>26</sup>

The starting point for interpreting Deut 32 is its narrative context within Deuteronomy itself. Although it has significant lexical affiliation with chapters 29-30,<sup>27</sup> the Song functions as part of the testamentary discourse<sup>28</sup> of Deut 31-34,<sup>29</sup> and its content and purpose are specifically delineated in Deut 31:14-30, 32:44-47. These sections have a number of similarities with Song itself; motifs like milk (31:20; 32:14), honey (31:20; 32:13) and filling (31:20; 32:15) reappear, and just as Israel will forsake YHWH (ἐγκαταλείπω – 31:16; 32:15, 18), so he would forsake them (καταλείπω – 31:17).<sup>30</sup> YHWH dictates the Song's contents to Moses and Joshua and instructs them to write it down and teach it to the people (31:19; cf. 31:22).<sup>31</sup> It is given in the tent of testimony (μαρτύριον – 31:14) as a witness (μαρτύριον) for YHWH against Israel (31:19, 31:21; cf. 32:46) in times of apostasy (31:20), and will

---

<sup>25</sup> Rad's assessment is typical: "(t)he so-called Song of Moses is a long widely ranging poem that came into existence quite independently of Deuteronomy" – Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (trans. Dorothea Barton; London: SCM, 1966), 195. See A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy: Based on the Revised Standard Version* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981), 371-82.

<sup>26</sup> J. G. McConville and J. Gary Millar, *Time and Place in Deuteronomy* (JSOTSup 179; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 86: "there is nothing in its content that excludes it from being exactly what it claims to be – a hymnic composition from the very earliest traditions of Israel on the verge of the land, as Moses looks rather pessimistically to the immediate future and beyond to the hope of eventual restoration."

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Levenson, "Inserted," 203-233. The respective speech markers in 29:1 and 33:1 (οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι/καὶ αὕτη ἡ εὐλογία; cf. 1:1/4:44) also suggest that Deut 29:1-32:52 be construed as a structural unit – so Norbert Lohfink, "Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab: Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dt 28:69-32:47," *BZ* 6 (1962): 32-56.

<sup>28</sup> Weinfeld, *Deuteronomism*, 10 proposes that both the Song and Deuteronomy passim are essentially valedictory orations, which reinforces the parallelism between chapter 32 and the whole book. On Deuteronomy's testamentary character, see Dennis T. Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994), 17-22.

<sup>29</sup> The change from speech to narrative at 31:1 after the apparently concluding tone of 30:20 marks some form of discourse shift – cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, lxxiii-lxxvii, 333-34; Leo Laberge, "Le Texte de Deutéronome 31 (Dt 31,1-29; 32,44-47)," in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies* (ed. Brekelmans C. and Lust J.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 143-60.

<sup>30</sup> Such similarities are often accounted for by treating 31:19-22 as part of the independent Song of Moses tradition and a subsequent interpolation to Deut 31. Cf. Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (trans. David E. Green; Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 189. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 336-38 ventures that 31:16-23 are the hand of the Elohist and not the Deuteronomist.

<sup>31</sup> Within 31:19 MT, both Moses and Joshua write the song (כתבו), but only Moses teaches it to Israel (למד). Deuteronomy 31:19 LXX applies both tasks to both leaders. Elsewhere, (31:22; 32:44a), both traditions restrict the actions solely to Moses.

remain so for future generations (31:21). As such, the Deuteronomist characterises the Song of Moses essentially as a Song of Witness.

The giving of the Song occurs within Joshua's commissioning by YHWH (31:16-23). This has caused many scholars to view the psalm as an imposition into the narrative,<sup>32</sup> an incursion upon, rather than an integral part of, Joshua's succession.<sup>33</sup> On this view, the Song's late inclusion occasioned the apparently incongruous and illogical redaction of Deut 31 whereby the torah is written down twice (31:9, 24), Joshua's commissioning is interrupted (31:19) and confused messages emerge as to who writes and teaches the Song.<sup>34</sup> Von Rad consequently argues: "the whole chapter (i.e. 31) contains debris of traditions rather than a real advance in the narrative."<sup>35</sup> Such redactional "debris" has consequently engendered scepticism as to Deut 31's interpretation of the Song's purposes. Lutyen, for example, questions its 'witness' characterisation, contending that "it is not, and such cannot have been the purpose of the author of the Song. The poem stresses much more the Lord's care and affection for the people than his anger and punitive plan."<sup>36</sup> Cunliffe-Jones similarly ventures that Deut 31's redactor "misunderstands the purpose of the Song" as it is one of comfort, not denunciation.<sup>37</sup> Tigay represents the majority view in saying that the witness context extends only to 32:1-25 and "disregards the second

---

<sup>32</sup> R. E. Clements, *The Book of Deuteronomy: A Preacher's Commentary* (Peterborough: Epworth, 2001), 133.

<sup>33</sup> In chapter 5 we argue that the Song and leadership transfer to Joshua are intrinsically linked, a principle recognised and reflected by Hebrews.

<sup>34</sup> Childs, *Introduction*, 220: "It has long been evident that ch. 32 has undergone a lengthy period of independent existence and only secondarily has been given its present context in relation to ch. 31." But he is also right that "little attention has been paid to its new role in this final form."

<sup>35</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 190. Anthony Phillips, *Deuteronomy* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 205 describes 31:14-29 as "very confused." G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," *IB* 2:309-537 represents the majority view: "(t)he order of material in this chapter seems rather badly mixed." See also Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 375-80. However, without negating a history of redaction, Brian M. Britt, *Rewriting Moses: The Narrative Eclipse of the Text* (JSOTSup 402; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 131-43; Labuschagne, "Setting," 119-28 and Talstra, "Deuteronomy," 95-103 stress how the received text is an artful and purposeful literary composition. On the concentric structure of Deut 31:1-30, see Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 752-55. Attempts to break up the text and reconstruct its chronology (cf. Patrick D. Miller, *Deuteronomy* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), 217-26) detract from the effects created by its received form.

<sup>36</sup> J. Luyten, "Primeval and Eschatological Overtones in the Song of Moses (Dt 32,1-43)," in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), 347.

<sup>37</sup> Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy: Introduction and Commentary* (TBC; London: SCM, 1951), 171.

part of the poem, which predicts that God will eventually deliver Israel and punish its enemies (vv26-43)."<sup>38</sup>

Whilst the chronology of Deut 31 is problematic, its oddities would surely have seemed equally awkward to the pericope's redactor(s), and are perhaps not accidental or irrelevant to the narrative discourse. Dogniez and Harl argue for the unity of chapters 31-32 within the Greek tradition and therefore for understanding the Song within its Deuteronomistic context: "le Cantique de Moïse ne se limite pas aux versets 1 à 43 du chapitre 32; il forme un tout avec l'ensemble du chapitre 31 qui lui sert d'introduction et les versets 44 à 47 qui tiennent lieu de conclusion."<sup>39</sup> John Watts also observes that Deut 32 is the only inset hymn or narrative psalm within the OT whose occurrence is specifically anticipated.<sup>40</sup> Such unique preparatory remarks would, therefore, seem to be both imperative for understanding the Song's function and purpose, and also indicative of its important role within the overall Deuteronomistic narrative.<sup>41</sup>

Deuteronomy 31 intertwines two accounts of textual transmission, the respective recordings of torah (twice – 31:9, 31:24) and Song (31:22). The purposes given for each recording are extremely similar; both discourses will function as a witness against Israel (31:26; 31:19, 21), in the context of their impending apostasy in the land (31:27; 31:20-21).<sup>42</sup> As the narrative ensues, the distinction between the two entities becomes blurred; it remains unclear, for example, whether the 'words' of 31:28 pertain to torah<sup>43</sup> or to Moses' delivery of the Song.<sup>44</sup> 'Words' are subsequently

---

<sup>38</sup> Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 506; cf. also Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 190-91: "this interpretation of the Song as issuing out of a state of penitence (Israel is accused by the words of the Song) is a very arbitrary one and it must be said diminishes to some extent the purport of the Song."

<sup>39</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 80.

<sup>40</sup> Watts, *Psalms*, 64-65; also Labuschagne, "Song," 85-86.

<sup>41</sup> So Labuschagne, "Song," 86: "the framework and the Song are so intimately interwoven that the Song cannot possibly be lifted from its context, let alone studied regardless of its framework."

<sup>42</sup> Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 297 differentiates the respective witness characterisations of torah and Song: "unlike the poem, it does not testify to Israel's betrayal of God after settling in Canaan. He probably means that the Teaching will serve as evidence that Israel accepted the terms and conditions of the covenant, which will enable the people to understand their misfortune." Tigay's distinction perhaps overstates the case; as with the Song, torah's witness status is given in anticipation of Israel's rebellion (31:27; cf. 31:20) and, in the narrative chronology at least, Israel's rebellion after the death of Moses (31:27) equates with their rebellion in the land (31:20).

<sup>43</sup> Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 380. This effectively denies any reference to the Song in 31:24-29.

<sup>44</sup> Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 343; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 441-42.

applied to both Song (31:30) and torah (32:46), though it remains equally ambiguous as to which 'words' are conceived in 32:44-45. The LXX may offer some distinction, by using λόγος for the words of torah (32:44, 46) and ῥῆμα for those of the Song (31:28; cf. 32:1).<sup>45</sup> This difference is borne out by 32:44 LXX, which, as well as repeating the opening line of 31:22 to end the Song, renders שִׁירָה with νόμος, thereby continuing the 'legal' dimension to λόγος.

This distinction, however, may only compound the extent to which νόμος and ὥδή are treated almost indeterminately. The inclusion of both terms in Deut 32:44 LXX, along with the rendering of שִׁירָה as νόμος, blurs the distinction between them, a blurring that continues into 32:45, where the absence of either ῥῆμα or λόγος for דָּבָר again leaves open the question of its referent.<sup>46</sup> Similarly, the neuter plural ᾶ (32:46), apparently modifying the masculine λόγος, may actually be a closet recollection of the neuter ῥήματα (words) of the song.<sup>47</sup> In short, the accounts of the giving of both law and song show great similarity, and, from a historical-critical position at least, it is unsurprising that von Rad proposes that a narrative about the law had been take over and re-applied to the Song.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> The following table illustrates the blurring of whether Song or torah is in view:

31:28	דָּבָר	λόγος	?
31:30	דָּבָר	ῥῆμα	Song
32:44	דָּבָר	λόγος	Song (MT) torah (LXX)
32:45	דָּבָר	_____	?
32:46	דָּבָר	λόγος	torah
32:47	דָּבָר	λόγος	?

See also Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 41-43.

<sup>46</sup> Levenson, "Inserted," 212 contends that 32:45-47 "speaks of the law, not the song"; this goes beyond the evidence and seeks to resolve the ambiguity, rather than uphold it.

<sup>47</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 536.

<sup>48</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 190; Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. Peter R. Ackroyd; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 227 proffers the converse position: "Since the song in any case at a later date was regarded as a summarising of the Deuteronomic law ..., we might go further and say that the song drew the law after it ..., and thus that the placing of the latter in its present position finds its explanation, or part of its explanation from this fact. "

The primary implications of the relationship between the Song and torah are given by this arrangement, though scholars have drawn different conclusions as to the nature of their association. Some have merely seen 31:24-29 as a restatement of the giving of the Song, effectively emending תורה/νόμος (31:24) to שירה/ὕμνη;<sup>49</sup> although such a reading ascribes a unity to 31:24-29, it neglects the fact that both traditions have preserved the 'law' reading. Alternatively, the Song has been viewed either as *a* torah (distinct from the torah of chapters 1-30),<sup>50</sup> or as part of the torah already presented in the whole book.<sup>51</sup> Either explanation is possible as both accord the Song torah 'status', yet one wonders whether either fully captures the Song's torah 'scope'. Since Deut 32:44 incorporates both the singing/teaching of the song and the giving of the law, the two are more likely treated as distinct, but complementary, parallel entities.<sup>52</sup> By splicing together the two narratives, the Song is placed on the same level as torah and exists as a sung version of it. It is not part of, or subservient to torah; rather, it encapsulates much of torah's scope, in summary, if not in detail.<sup>53</sup> Fraade notes how "the rabbis regularly understood Deut 31:19... to refer not only to the specific song that follows, but to the Torah as a whole *of which it is a précis*."<sup>54</sup> Watts comes to a similar conclusion, arguing that the Song was a memorable way of recollecting the law's content, a "popular" version as opposed to the "official" one

---

<sup>49</sup> Carl Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium* (HKAT 1/3.1; Göttingen: 1923), 163-64; Alfred Bertholet, *Deuteronomium* (KHC 5; Freiburg: Mohr (Siebeck), 1899), 93-94.

<sup>50</sup> Michael A. Fishbane, "Varia Deuteronomica," *ZAW* 84 (1972): 349-52; Labuschagne, "Setting," 124. Cf. Laberge, "Texte," 145: "Nous rencontrons donc ici plus qu'une simple introduction à un cantique: cantique et loi forment une même réalité."

<sup>51</sup> Talstra, "Deuteronomy," 99-100 asserts that torah's authority rises because of the Song and assumes its 'witness' role.

<sup>52</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 225 speaks of some form of mutuality ("they serve similar functions, and Israel is to learn them both and carry them both into the land"), yet the distinction is blurred by the apparent subservience of the Song that "has now become part of Torah."

<sup>53</sup> Christopher J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy* (NIBCOT 4; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 305. Jean-Pierre Sonnet, *The Book within the Book: Writing in Deuteronomy* (Biblical Interpretation Series 14; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 163-64 proposes that the Song is a supplement to Torah; the former's witness characterisation changes the latter's status such that torah too becomes a witness.

<sup>54</sup> Steven D. Fraade, *From Torah to Commentary: Torah and its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 146, my emphasis. He cites *b. Sanh* 21b where the instruction to pass on a torah scroll is upheld by the writing of the song (citing Deut 31:19). Fraade goes on to suggest that Torah and Song were viewed as the same entity: "the rabbis understood them to speak of one and the same thing: the establishing of the song-Torah as a witness against Israel after Moses' death through its regular recitation and study" (146).

encapsulated within torah.<sup>55</sup> It brings torah to Israel's mind, it has a "nagging presence" that comes forth in times of crisis;<sup>56</sup> its giving is "part of the fulfilment of the promise that the word is in people's mouth and heart (30:14)."<sup>57</sup>

The parallelism between Song and torah is another reason to speak of *Ha'azinu* and Deuteronomy as in some way co-terminus. Venema proposes that the structure of chapter 31, especially 31:24-25, ascribes to torah the same content or scope as the book of Deuteronomy: "(a)t the very moment when we hear about the writing of this book of the Torah, the attention is drawn to Moses' address as a whole, which ultimately puts the book of Torah on a par with Deuteronomy itself."<sup>58</sup> If torah is indeed "on a par with Deuteronomy," and if, likewise, the Song receives the same accreditation accorded torah, then *mutatis mutandis*, the Song and Deuteronomy itself are ascribed similar status and value.<sup>59</sup>

### **2.2.2 Background of Research and Issues**

Partly because of the redactional complexities of Deut 31, historic scholarship has tended to dissociate the Song from its narrative context. It has instead been treated as an independent unit,<sup>60</sup> with emphasis devoted primarily to the Song's provenance, date and genre.<sup>61</sup> Despite the abundance of material produced, attention to such

---

<sup>55</sup> Watts, *Psalm*, 79-81; see also Carlson, *David*, 235-36. Nathan MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism"* (FAT II/1; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003), 145 describes the Song's function as a "summary of the Torah." Britt, *Rewriting*, 137-38 observes that the "ambiguity" of Torah is "never resolved," but its content incorporates both the Song and the law.

<sup>56</sup> Harold Fisch, *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), 51. MacDonald, *Monotheism*, 145 contends that it had an ongoing presence, in good times and bad; however, the core context of Deut 31:20-21 is apostasy and its consequent judgment, suggesting, with Fisch, that the song is recalled primarily in times of difficulty.

<sup>57</sup> MacDonald, *Monotheism*, 147. This is enhanced by the reference to the Song being in the mouth (31:19).

<sup>58</sup> G. J. Venema, *Reading Scripture in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 9-10; 31, 2 Kings 22-23, Jeremiah 36, Nehemiah 8* (OtSt 48; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 42-43.

<sup>59</sup> McConville and Millar, *Time*, 85 note that the Song shares the purpose of Deuteronomy – to "point the nation back to YHWH in its time of rebellion."

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Eissfeldt, *Old Testament*, 226: "The Song of Moses, xxxii, 1-43 and the Blessing of Moses, xxxiii, may be relatively easily lifted from their context."

<sup>61</sup> For a comprehensive review of scholarship on such issues, see Paul Sanders, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (OtSt 37; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1-98.

historical issues has produced little consensus.<sup>62</sup> Mooted dates for the Song vary across a wide spectrum, with it seen either as a late ((post-)exilic) invention,<sup>63</sup> a product of the prophetic era,<sup>64</sup> an early, possibly preexilic, composition,<sup>65</sup> or even accorded to the historical Moses himself.<sup>66</sup> Specific dating has proved difficult on lexical grounds,<sup>67</sup> but even more because of the related issue identity of the 'no people' (32:21), regularly cited as tying the Song's date to a particular historical threat.<sup>68</sup> Once again, diversity is prominent, with the Canaanites,<sup>69</sup> Assyrians<sup>70</sup>, Chaldeans,<sup>71</sup> Philistines,<sup>72</sup> the 'Sea People'<sup>73</sup> and the Samaritans<sup>74</sup> all variously postulated as candidates, and with little consensus established or progress made.<sup>75</sup>

In terms of genre, the Song has commonly been understood as a covenant *rîb*, a quasi-judicial witness against Israel that convicts them of their rebellion against YHWH and announces the consequent, merited divine judgment.<sup>76</sup> The *rîb* genre

---

<sup>62</sup> Sanders, *Provenance*, 96 wryly observes: "The number of theories with regard to the provenance of the Song is so large that one is in danger of no longer seeing the wood for the trees."

<sup>63</sup> Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 380-82; Fohrer, *Introduction*, 189-90.

<sup>64</sup> Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy*, 172.

<sup>65</sup> Umberto Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (2vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1973), 41-46 and Otto Eissfeldt, *Das Lied Moses, Deuteronomium 32, 1-43, und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs, Psalm 78, Samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes* (BVS AWL Philologisch-Historische Klasse Bd. 104, Heft 5; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958) date it to the time of the judges.

<sup>66</sup> George A. F. Knight, *The Song of Moses: A Theological Quarry* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 6.

<sup>67</sup> Sanders, *Provenance*, 40-57.

<sup>68</sup> This is problematic as the judgment is announced to Israel, but then transferred to their enemies. It "serves the purpose of a threat rather than referring to a particular historical occasion" – Labuschagne, "Song," 95.

<sup>69</sup> Cassuto, *Biblical*, 42-43.

<sup>70</sup> Andreas Reichert, "The Song of Moses (Dt 32) and the Quest for Early Deuteronomie Psalmody," in *Proc, 9th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, Aug 1985* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986), 59.

<sup>71</sup> Phillips, *Deuteronomy*, 218; Fohrer, *Introduction*, 190.

<sup>72</sup> Eissfeldt, *Old Testament*, 227.

<sup>73</sup> Johannes Cornelis de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETL 91; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990).

<sup>74</sup> E. Sellin, "Wann Wurde das Moseslied Deut. 32 Gedichtet?" *ZAW* 43 (1928): 164-72.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 374: "the song does not refer to particular events; it is generally prophetic in expressing Moses' vision of the future."

<sup>76</sup> Wright, "Lawsuit," 26-67, Herbert B. Huffmon, "Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* 78 (1959): 288-89; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 380-81.

takes seriously the Song's witness characterisation and gives substance to the themes of Israel's guilt (32:15-18) and sentence (32:19-25), but its application to the whole of 32:1-43 remains problematic. The Song's opening foray is didactic (32:2) as much as condemnatory, and its legal dimension dissipates after 32:25; it has therefore been termed a "broken" or "expanded" *riḇ* to take account of vv26-43.<sup>77</sup> Moreover, these latter verses advocate YHWH's supremacy and the vindication of his servants;<sup>78</sup> 32:43 culminates in joyful celebration not in sober warning. It is YHWH's triumph in judgment that is asserted, not Israel's demise, and, for those who faithfully serve YHWH, the Song offers significant hope.<sup>79</sup>

Other generic proposals for the Song have included "deliberative *riḇ*,"<sup>80</sup> "salvation oracle",<sup>81</sup> liturgical hymn,<sup>82</sup> or military song,<sup>83</sup> the first three of which incorporate some element of lawsuit imagery. Scholars have also emphasized the Song's similarities with the wisdom tradition,<sup>84</sup> suggesting that it has a didactic force that sets forth before Israel the dangers of rebellion, to discourage them from pursuing apostasy or faithlessness. Partly because of this heuristic sense, partly because of its similarities to Ps. 78 (entitled a מִשְׁכִּיל),<sup>85</sup> the song has been identified as a "didactic poem"<sup>86</sup> whose primary force is essentially instructive rather than condemnatory. The Song is also often described as a *Misgedicht*,<sup>87</sup> embracing both accusatory and didactic elements.<sup>88</sup> Weitzman's suggestion that the mixture of forms

---

<sup>77</sup> Wright, "Lawsuit," 56-58. John M. Wiebe, "The Form, Setting and Meaning of the Song of Moses," *StudBT* 17, no. 2 (1989): 123. rightly surmises: "to really understand this text one must find what the second part of Dt 32 is doing and how it relates to the lawsuit found at the beginning."<sup>77</sup>

<sup>78</sup> Luyten, "Primeval," 345 brings out the element of divine vindication; נָקָם and שָׁלֵם are used 4 & 3 times respectively in 32:34-43 (following 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>79</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 138. Deuteronomy 32:45-47, in particular, brings out this hopeful dimension.

<sup>80</sup> Wiebe, "Form," 121-43.

<sup>81</sup> Nigosian, "Song," 8.

<sup>82</sup> Matthew Thiessen, "The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43)," *JBL* 123 (2004): 56-58.

<sup>83</sup> Cassuto, *Biblical*, 41-45.

<sup>84</sup> James R. Boston, "Wisdom Influence Upon the Song of Moses," *JBL* 87 (1968): 198-202; Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 200; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 345.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. the seminal study of Eissfeldt, *Lied*.

<sup>86</sup> Reichert, "Song," 57; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 345. Boston, "Wisdom," 200 terms the genre "invocation of the teacher."

<sup>87</sup> So Nigosian, "Song," 8.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 225: "it convicts as it instructs; it instructs as it convicts."



constitutes a testamentary or last words discourse may provide the best explanation for the genre,<sup>89</sup> particularly as this accords with the Song's overall context in Deuteronomy.

Whilst scholarship has helpfully identified much of the Song's individual nuances, our approach affirms the text's position within the Deuteronomic narrative. The Song remains a witness *for YHWH against Israel*, and both testimonial elements are fundamental to the Song's interpretation; the witness characterisation is greater than the legal parameters provided by the *rîb* model and not confined just to 32:1-25. Whilst 32:1-25 (and, we shall argue, 32:28-29, 35-38) witness *against Israel*, 32:26-43 equally witness *for YHWH*, warning both of his sovereignty and incomparability in judgment (32:39), and his compassionate care for his servants (32:36).<sup>90</sup> The primary agent of the Song (in accord with the whole of Deut 29-32) is YHWH himself, not Israel; their only action is rebellion against him (32:15-18).

The song εἰς μαρτύριον must therefore be understood not so much as a trial witness, incriminating or indicting Israel, but rather as a cautionary exhortation that warns Israel of the importance of faithfulness in the land and the dire consequences of disobedience to YHWH.<sup>91</sup> Just as Deut 31:16-22 contextually anticipates the Song, so Deut 32:45-47 also contributes to the hymn's 'framing'.<sup>92</sup> The words of the Song (and torah) are to be Israel's life (32:45-47) and their life-giving nature assumes an ironic significance when delivered by someone to whose death the narrative next turns (32:48-52), a death occasioned by faithlessness. They are not just idle words, they are central to Israel's ongoing life and existence in the land (32:46-47).<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Steven Weitzman, "Lessons from the Dying: The Role of Deuteronomy 32 in its Narrative Setting," *HTR* 87 (1994): 377-93; also Fohrer, *Introduction*, 189-90.

<sup>90</sup> Sanders, *Provenance*, 431: "Every verse in the song suits its interpretation as a poem which in a period of dire straits announces that God will turn away from his anger and will have compassion on his people."

<sup>91</sup> *L.A.B.* 19:4 seems to view more than just Deut 32 as 'witness' material, thereby suggesting once more that the Song's influence and remit embody much of the Deuteronomic frame.

<sup>92</sup> See Labuschagne, "Setting," 111-29.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. MacDonald, *Monotheism*, 144.

### **2.2.3 Exegesis of the Song**

The Song's flow and thematic development is well traced in the commentaries, and the volume of its lexical, exegetical and poetic nuances precludes attention to every single aspect of the chapter. Likewise, detailed examination of particular verses fits better in the discussion of the way in which Hebrews interacts with them and so awaits further analysis there. However, for our present purposes, a review of the Song's progress is still pertinent, for the precise structural breakdown of the song is disputed among scholars. In particular, our concern is the scope and content of 32:35-36 and its implications for Israel, especially the extent to which Israel is included in YHWH's vengeance.

As with many others, Miller casts 32:1-6 as the introduction to the Song, differentiating between the formal and the thematic introductions (32:1-3, 32:4-6 respectively).<sup>94</sup> The Song begins with the invitation to heaven and earth to hear or listen to the divine word (32:1). They possibly function as witnesses to the divine lawsuit,<sup>95</sup> but bearing in mind the teacher/pupil/wisdom motif of vv1-2, they are more likely participants in or observers of the educational process anticipated within the song, present in order "to elevate the praise of YHWH to a cosmic scale."<sup>96</sup> Deuteronomy 32:2 fits ill with the lawsuit genre and was viewed as an interpolation by Wright,<sup>97</sup> yet its emphasis on words (cf. 31:30) and instruction concord with the view of torah as instruction for life in the land (cf. 32:45-47). Irrespective of its original status within the song, 32:2 befits the context of chs. 31-32.

The thematic introduction of 32:4-6 provides the theme verses for the song, contrasting the faithfulness of YHWH (32:4) with the unfaithfulness of Israel (32:5-6).<sup>98</sup> The verses signal the discourse of YHWH's chosen blessing of Israel (32:8-14), and her subsequent rejection of him along with the consequent punishment (32:15-25). Within the broad lawsuit structure, 32:7-14 commences the case for the

---

<sup>94</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 227; see also Wiebe, "Form," 132; Nigosian, "Song," 9. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 348 notes that 32:1-3 has the form of a prologue.

<sup>95</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 226; Wright, "Lawsuit," 44-49; *Sif Deut* 306.14.

<sup>96</sup> Britt, *Rewriting*, 151.

<sup>97</sup> Wright, "Lawsuit," 54.

<sup>98</sup> Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 344; Cf. also MacDonald, *Monotheism*, 148: "The main theme of the Song is the contrast between the faithfulness of YHWH and the unfaithfulness of Israel."

prosecution,<sup>99</sup> celebrating the divine election of Israel and YHWH's past provision for her in the wilderness. YHWH's election is given primeval origin (32:8-9) and the desert years are recalled as the place in which YHWH called Israel and unilaterally provided for her (32:10-12). But the future is also anticipated; the song presupposes life in the land and Israel is proleptically placed in Canaan as the recipient of abundant provision and blessing (32:13-14).<sup>100</sup>

The tone shifts in 32:15-18. The verses recall 31:20 and trace Israel's rebellion against YHWH, their pursuit of other gods, and their abandonment of the One who had chosen and formed them. As with 32:13-14, future disobedience in the land is recalled retrospectively, as past action, adding to the heuristic value of the song; narrative chronology and historical specificity are both subjugated to rhetorical and didactic concerns.

Israel's faithlessness leads to YHWH's judgment upon them (32:19-25). His punishment of Israel accords with the offence they committed (see section 3.2.1), and the threatened judgment seems universal and inescapable. It is at this point in the Song that the lawsuit motif falls down. Its precise terminus is disputed, but some form of shift in the argument occurs in 32:26-27. Although the first-person usage remains (presumably YHWH speaking), these are potential bridge or transition verses in the Song. They temper the prior arguments regarding the destruction of Israel (32:19:25), not because of any merit on Israel's part, but because of YHWH's reputation in the eyes of the enemy should they face destruction. The verses elaborate a "detailed deliberation in the heart of God – a soliloquy within the depths of the divine heart,"<sup>101</sup> whereby the inner ponderings of YHWH himself are exposed.

Most commentators understand 32:28 as changing the Song's focus away from Israel (32:7-27).<sup>102</sup> The pejorative tone of 32:31 and the 'their rock/our rock' comparison suggests the nations are likely in view by this point, but there remains the possibility, particularly in view of the opaque language, that Israel is still included within the deliberations of 32:27-28.<sup>103</sup> Although the referent to יְהוָה/ἑθνος

---

<sup>99</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 196 contends v7 is part of the introduction.

<sup>100</sup> The Song probably functions as a *vaticinium ex eventu* – so Eissfeldt, *Old Testament*, 237.

<sup>101</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 198; see also the notion of 'deliberative rib' in Wiebe, "Form," 121-43.

<sup>102</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 148; Wright, *Deuteronomy (NIBC)*, 302.

<sup>103</sup> So Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 385-86; Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 808.

(32:28) suggests a *predominantly* Gentile referent, the lament regarding the nation's lack of wisdom and understanding recalls the prior, foundational accusation against Israel of their foolishness (32:6),<sup>104</sup> and they may implicitly share in the accusation levied.<sup>105</sup> Such a fusing together of Israel with their enemies/the nations in 32:28-29 provides both a precedent for a further blurring of ethnic distinctions in 32:34-36 and, at the same time, offers hope for the nations should they acknowledge YHWH's supremacy. The description of the recipients of divine favour in ethnically non-specific terms such as 'servants' (32:36) suggests that the Song's message of hope is not restricted purely to Israel. Indeed, if the nations are to be universally judged, why summon them to rejoice in YHWH's supremacy (32:43 LXX)?<sup>106</sup>

With its usage of the third person, Deut 32:30-33 clearly has Israel's enemies in primary focus. The subject matter, however, of the vitriolic condemnation of their gods and their (bitter) wine is mildly reminiscent of the benefits of YHWH's provision for Israel (fruit of the fields – 32:12; wine – 32:14) and may further represent the blurring of the distinction between Israel and the nations. Wiebe, following Boston, finds in this section elements of remorse on Israel's behalf,<sup>107</sup> but this is, at best, only implicit; instead the flavour of the pericope is of a third party narrator condemning the nations' actions in anticipation of YHWH's vengeance/judgment. Such vengeance is announced in 32:34, but is anticipated earlier in the Song; rather than referring to v33,<sup>108</sup> ταῦτα (32:34) recalls the punishment of 32:29, which, although primarily orientated to the nations, may also include Israel.

The ethnic ambiguity reaches its apex in 32:35-36. Some scholars erect a structural marker between the two verses, asserting that 32:35 retains a focus purely

---

<sup>104</sup> Cf. the common lack of wisdom (חָכְמָה) – 32:6, 32:29.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 457-58. Britt, *Rewriting*, 155 proposes: "(a)t the same time, and as is usually the case with oracles against the nations, through ambiguity and implication, Israel too is indirectly implied." Israel may even be the primary referent of the accusation (cf. Knight, *Song*, 93).

<sup>106</sup> Deuteronomy 32:43 LXX reads εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, cited by Paul in support of Gentile participation in the glory of God (Rom 15:10). The MT equivalent (הֲרַנְּנוּ גוֹיִם עִמּוֹ) would not encourage such a conclusion.

<sup>107</sup> Wiebe, "Form," 126-27. Much of his analysis builds on J. R. Boston, "The Song of Moses: Deuteronomy 32:1-43" (PhD diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1967).

<sup>108</sup> As suggested by Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 387.

on the enemies, whilst 32:36 turns the spotlight upon Israel.<sup>109</sup> On this line of thought, 32:34-35 proclaims divine vengeance on Israel's enemies whilst 32:36 asserts Israel's deliverance through a demonstration of YHWH's compassion and faithfulness.<sup>110</sup> The mode of deliverance is not specific as יָׁצַד/κρίνω in 32:36 can be interpreted in two ways.<sup>111</sup> It may be understood either as 'vindicate' (NRSV; NASB),<sup>112</sup> whereby YHWH judges on behalf of his people,<sup>113</sup> or, in its more customary legal sense, as implying that through the judicial process, Israel is shown compassion and the sentence is commuted or revoked.<sup>114</sup> The first sense enhances the contrast between v35 and v36, whilst the latter allows for some element of continuity, but in either case, the predominant sense is Israel's preservation or sustenance through YHWH's faithfulness as only He can so do (cf. 32:39). The parallelism of 32:36a is synonymous<sup>115</sup> – 'people' and 'servants' are equivalents, and the καὶ/waw is conjunctive, rather than adversative.

Such a 'positive' reading of 32:36 is conversant with the prior Deuteronomic narrative, in which divine grace (30:1-10) is applied in the aftermath of Israel's cursing and apostasy (chs. 27-29).<sup>116</sup> It is also an attested reading elsewhere; Ps 135:14 repeats the verse verbatim to affirm YHWH's care for his people. Nonetheless, it remains debatable whether it is indeed the *only* possible reading of 32:35-36; it is conceivable that the blurred identity distinctions we have referred to previously may also impinge upon the interpretation of these verses. From 32:28f, the difference between Israel and the enemies has remained obscure, and the ambiguity remains unresolved by 32:36. Israel is potentially included within the scope of 'their day of calamity' (32:35), the vagueness of the warning negating any restriction on ethnic lines. McConville acknowledges this possibility, speculating:

---

<sup>109</sup> Nigosian, "Song," 11-12. It is true that the change in person between v35 and v36 does suggest a change in focus or scope.

<sup>110</sup> This 'positive' reading of 32:36a is followed by most commentators – Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 99-100; Sanders, *Provenance*, 230-31.

<sup>111</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 459.

<sup>112</sup> The TNIV now reads 'vindicate' rather than 'judge' (NIV).

<sup>113</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 529.

<sup>114</sup> This would seem to be the case for Wiebe's deliberative *rib* model – cf. Wiebe, "Form," 142-43.

<sup>115</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 199; Eduard Nielsen, *Deuteronomium* (HAT 1/6; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995), 292.

<sup>116</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 437-38.

"(r)hetorically speaking, ... v.35 might also be heard by Israel as reinforcing the warning to them, too, that is the chief theme of the Song."<sup>117</sup> They may not just "hear" it, they may be included within its domain.

The parallelism of 32:36a is, therefore, conceivably antithetical;<sup>118</sup> instead of being synonymous, 'people' and 'servants' are either opposing terms, or servants are cast as a (faithful) subset of the people.<sup>119</sup> The Song asserts the vindication and comfort of those who faithfully embrace the covenant (the servants – 32:36b), but equally anticipates the demise of those who have spurn the divine call (32:36a).<sup>120</sup> The Song's hopeful message of YHWH's vindication of his servants is muted by the lack of specific declaration as to the fate of unfaithful Israel.<sup>121</sup>

Several factors support this more 'negative' view. At the Song's climax (32:43), atonement is made for the land, not the actions of the people,<sup>122</sup> and this partially tempers the Song's hopeful message. Indeed, Watts proposes that it is the blessing of Moses (Deut 33) that actually engenders hope, not the Song. Appealing to the Deut 31 context, he ventures: "the psalm's statements of hope are sufficiently muted and obscure to allow a reading to be swayed by the narrative's depiction of

---

<sup>117</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 458.

<sup>118</sup> Antithetical parallelism does occur in the Song – 32:27; cf. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 508. Richard H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11* (WUNT 2/63; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994), 264 assumes that the parallelism of 32:36 must be synonymous, causing him to view 'people' and 'servants' as equivalent terms.

<sup>119</sup> Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 375 records this as an attested view, citing Keil, but rejects it as "forced." He concedes that penitent Israel is "implicitly" in mind in v36, but counters: "the fate of impenitent Israel lies outside the range of the poet's thought." Keil assigns vv32-35 to Israel; in our view, a better position is to recognise the blurred distinction between Israel and the nations from 32:28-36. Luther conceives of a similar distinction between 'servants' and 'people' and takes the more negative view of 32:36a: "This means that he will not spare even His own people, lest they boast that they are His people. But He will be merciful without respect of persons, only to those who serve Him" – Jaroslav Jan Pelikan and Daniel E. Poellot, eds., *Luther's Works. Vol. 9, Lectures on Deuteronomy* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1960), 298.

<sup>120</sup> The primacy of 'servants' over the 'people' has support in 32:43 MT, where atonement is made for the blood of the servants (not for the people). However, the LXX has υἱῶν at this point, so the support is not persuasive.

<sup>121</sup> Kline, *Treaty*, 143 ventures: "God's judgment of the enemy would be an act of vengeance and vindication in behalf of *at least the faithful remnant of Israel*" (my emphasis). Implicit in Kline's statement is that faithless Israel is somehow not party to the divine vindication.

<sup>122</sup> Following the LXX, not the MT, partly because of Hebrews' Greek preference, partly because LXX is the better reading (see 3.1.1.2). Deuteronomy 32:43 MT's וְכָפַר אֶדְמָתוֹ עָמּוֹ is also syntactically difficult to resolve. However, *Ketub*. 111a exegetes 32:43 as "makes expiation for his people," with no mention of the land.

it."<sup>123</sup> Second, if Israel is included in the scope of vv28-29 and vv35-36a, then the Song's witness characterisation (i.e. 'against Israel') extends to the whole text and not just vv1-25; Israel is guilty and any vindication is solely on YHWH's terms. Third, whilst the meaning of 32:36b MT is somewhat unclear, its Greek rendering has YHWH seeing his servants paralysed (παράλελυμένους). Some form of judgment has been dispensed upon both the enemies *and* Israel. YHWH both 'wounds' and 'heals' (32:39); he may vindicate his people, but not without some form of sentence being enacted. The obliteration of 32:26 is not fulfilled for fear of the enemies' mockery (32:26-27), but the sentence is reduced, not removed. Fourth, Deut 32:5 LXX anticipates Israel being the recipient of judgment; they are no longer 'sons', they are 'blameworthy',<sup>124</sup> and their status as 'his people' is in question. If vv4-6 form theme verses for the whole Song and not just 32:7-25, then one must take seriously the declaration that Israel's disobedience is not completely eclipsed by YHWH's faithfulness and compassion.<sup>125</sup> Fifth, 32:35 LXX<sup>126</sup> renders ὑμῖν for מִלְּךָ, thereby extending the remit of the ἡμέρα ἐκδικήσεως/ἀπωλείας to include those addressed by the Song, and not merely the third-party enemies. Whilst the second-person reference could anticipate Israel's divine vindication in 32:36 (and hence be viewed as salutary in orientation),<sup>127</sup> the parallelism between 32:35c and 32:35d seems synonymous rather than antithetical (cf. ἐγγὺς/ἔτοιμα), and therefore carries negative connotations. Israel somehow shares in, and is warned of, the peril of YHWH's impending judgment.

---

<sup>123</sup> Watts, *Psalm*, 70; cf. R. E. Clements, *Deuteronomy* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 47: "the future that is set before the people in this poem is an open one – judgment cannot be discounted and the punitive effects of God's wrath may yet prevail."

<sup>124</sup> Deut 32:5a LXX reads ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά. We follow Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 323 in breaking the verse into three units ("they have sinned, they are no longer his sons, they are blameworthy") rather than the single unit of Wevers, *Notes*, 511 ("disgraceful children who are not his have sinned").

<sup>125</sup> Though cf. *Sifre Deut* 308.1: "they are still his children."

<sup>126</sup> On 32:35's textual issues, see 3.1.2.

<sup>127</sup> Marguerite Harl, "Le Grand Cantique de Moïse en Deutéronome 32: Quelques Traits Originaux de la Version Grecque des Septante," in *Rashi 1040-1990: Hommage À Ephraïm E. Urbach: Congrès Européen des Études Juives* (ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna; Paris: Cerf, 1993), 196-97 appeals to the lack of menace in πάρεστιν and therefore casts ἔτοιμα in a beneficial sense.

The targumic tradition does little to alleviate these blurred distinctions.<sup>128</sup> Onqelos does not expressly identify the protagonists of 32:35, but its exilic language ("they will be banished from their land") naturally extends to Israel rather than nations. Likewise, whilst it sounds a positive note of divine rescue in 32:36 – YHWH avenges the cause of his *righteous* servants – the fate of unrighteous or unfaithful Israel is left unresolved. Only the servants – and not his people – are specifically "righteous." Pseudo-Jonathan (P-J) shares Onqelos' exilic reading of 32:35, and this perspective extends to 32:36; "his people" are specifically named as Israel, but even "the faithful doers of good deeds will be cut off" into exile, a judgment that is described as both merciful and lamented by YHWH. P-J 32:39 may anticipate the salutary nature of this exile/judgment, but 32:36 retains an essentially pessimistic orientation: of itself, it offers little – if any – indication of divine vindication. Neofiti makes Israel the focus of 32:36, but YHWH is "remorseful" only over his just servants' suffering, not that of "his people." For them, YHWH's judgment is merciful, rather than vindictory. Whilst the Song's various targumic renderings may ultimately proclaim the triumph of YHWH and his servants (especially in 32:43), there is no consensus on how judgment/vindication of the nations and/or Israel pans out in 32:35-36.<sup>129</sup>

The Midrash offers a similar lack of clarity. Whilst *Sifre Deut* 325-326 distinguishes between the judgment of Israel and that of the nations (especially 325.5-326.1), Israel remains the recipient of some form of punishment (325.5), and seems to be included within the scope of 32:35. Section 326.1 likewise understands 'people' to refer to or include the nations, whereas 'servants' is confined solely to Israel. The discourse on 32:37 perhaps exemplifies the Song's inherent ambiguity, with *Sifre Deut* 327 interpreting the 'they' of 32:37 (potentially the same group judged/vindicated in 32:36) as either Israel (R. Judah) or the nations (R. Nehemiah). Samaritan midrash on the Song is also somewhat hedged, suggesting that vindication is predicated upon the actions/status of the faithful: "When the great prophet Moses informed Israel of the Day of Vengeance, he gave them good news of the deliverance

---

<sup>128</sup> See the helpful comparison of targumic renderings of 32:36 in Bernard Grossfeld, *The Aramaic Bible. Vol. 9, the Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy; Translated, with Apparatus, and Notes* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 99n69-70.

<sup>129</sup> Thus we find difficult the assessment that the targumic interpretation of the judgment of 32:36 is "a vindicating, pitying, restoring work – in favour of God's people, not against them" – Proctor, "Judgement," 77.



from it; but the good news and the deliverance were only for the sons of merit, and the doers of good deeds."<sup>130</sup> Implicit is that the non-"doers of good deeds" do not participate in the divine deliverance.

The Song climaxes in an assertion of YHWH's supremacy and authority in judgment (32:37-42), voiced by both the narrator (32:37-38)<sup>131</sup> and YHWH himself (32:39-42). Deuteronomy 32:37-38 MT focuses upon either the nations or, more likely, Israel, especially as the LXX uses the 2<sup>nd</sup> person in 32:38. Perhaps more than anywhere else in the Song, verses 39-42 affirm its witness 'for YHWH' aspect. YHWH is the primary – indeed sole – protagonist and the Song asserts his pre-eminence, with minimal reference to Israel. The psalm finishes with a summarising exhortation (32:43),<sup>132</sup> the end of the Song marked by the subscript in 32:44 LXX.

#### **2.2.4 Summary**

The Song of Moses paradigmatically instructs its audience of the consequences of disobedience, premised upon the reality of past experience. The addressees are rhetorically transferred back to the wilderness era; generational distinctions are blurred and the contemporary audience once more become part of the Deuteronomic story and the *de facto* wilderness generation. Deuteronomy 32's characterisation as an ongoing witness encourages this historical play, and the Song's narrative chronological hermeneutic is among its most important features. It is "a catechetical song that seeks to bring the past to remembrance in order to shape the present and future for a new generation."<sup>133</sup> Its paradigmatic, ongoing uniqueness

---

<sup>130</sup> Memar Marqah 4.12. The translation is from John Bowman, *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion, and Life* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977), 257. The text is relatively late (4<sup>th</sup> century, possibly later if book 4 is a subsequent addition) and derivative from a verse of contested textual traditions. However, it still attests the *possibility* of understanding Deut 32:35's scope as extending to Israel.

<sup>131</sup> The Targums ascribe this speech to the enemies, portraying it as a jibe against Israel in a similar fashion to 32:27.

<sup>132</sup> On Deut 32:43, see 3.1.1.2

<sup>133</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 139. Within the Midrash, the song's scope extends to the distant future and, the Sifre includes the coming world within the Song's horizons; on v43, for instance, Rabbi Meir suggests that the events described pertain to the world to come – see Bassar, *Margins*, 68-69. *L.A.B.* 19:4 may allude to Deut 32:1 (or 4:26) as signifying 'the end of the world' and thereby the inauguration of the world to come.

militates against chronological specificity, and any quest for a precise historical referent is not just inconclusive, but also misses its inherently ahistorical function.<sup>134</sup>

The Song's broad diversity of characterisation, speakers and participants facilitates not just its ongoing usage, but also its plurality of readings. It testifies to YHWH's vindication of his servants and triumph over the nations, but at the same time, is cautious about exactly who might comprise those people; there is no *carte blanche* for Israel. Both vindication and judgment are realistic options; Israel may be rejected on account of her apostasy, or YHWH may unilaterally and covenantally justify his people. It is left ambiguous as to whether Israel is exonerated, shown mercy, wounded but later healed, or (for those 'non-servants' who have been truly faithless) judged in the same terms as the nations. Israel's primary summons is to remain faithful.

### **2.3 The Use of the Greater Song outside Deuteronomy**

Although we have given significant weight to the Song's Deut 31-32 framework, *Ha'azinu* also possesses a life within Second Temple society beyond this textual context.<sup>135</sup> Such independent existence, however, does not necessarily deny its Deuteronomic provenance. When quoting the Song, for example, Paul attributes it to Moses (Rom 10:19; cf. Deut 32:21) and appeals to the text's written character (Rom 12:19; cf. Deut 32:35). The Song is regarded as the one Moses *taught* (4 Macc 18:18-19)<sup>136</sup> and in 2 Macc 7:6, the martyred brother cites Deut 32:36, describing it as the Song voiced by Moses that *bore witness* against the people. Since 'witness' language is absent from the Song itself and as the martyr appeals to YHWH's vindication and compassion, the reference to ἀντιμαρτυρούσης must originate from the writer's familiarity with the Deut 31 context. Similar familiarity may be seen in Josephus,

---

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Thiessen, "Form," 423: "The author's goal was not to describe a particular historical situation but to compose a liturgical work that would not quickly become obsolete. The very nature of a liturgical work is that it lends itself to being used for recurring occasions." Also Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 137: "Once learned, the Song Moses becomes indelibly imprinted on human hearts, moving with God's people into the future across boundaries of time, space and culture."

<sup>135</sup> For a comprehensive review of the Song's use in Second Temple Judaism, see Bell, *Provoked*, 200-85.

<sup>136</sup> In 4 Macc 18:18-19, the widow's husband is praised for teaching the Song to his sons, implicitly fulfilling the hymn's ongoing didactic purpose across generations. The combination in 4 Macc 18:19 of Deut 32:39 and 30:20 is further evidence of the Song retaining its Deuteronomic provenance.

whose account of Moses' giving of a hexameter poem (*Ant.* 4.303) confirms the Deuteronomic picture, in terms of both narrative chronology and justification. He characterises Moses as διμαρτηκότος, a rare word whose rendering can only be predicated upon the μαρτύριον backdrop of Deut 31. Josephus adds that the Song predicted both what would happen, and also what still happens *in his time* (cf. Deut 31:21); the Song apparently still possessed an ongoing testimonial function against Israel within the Second Temple period.

Yet it remains the case that the Song's warning aspect is in some degree minimalised within contemporary Jewish understanding. Weitzman suggests that there is a distinct difference between the Song's use in Deuteronomy and its use in broader Judaism. Rather than serving as a witness against Israel, it functioned as "an act of praise and thanksgiving *from Moses to God*."<sup>137</sup> Although the context for recounting the singing of the Song in *Virt.* 72-75 is the Mosaic transfer of power to Joshua, Weitzman notes how Philo's description of the Song is one of praise (Moses 'hymns' God); both the function of the Song (praise, rather than warning) and the recipient of its message (YHWH, rather than Israel) have been altered.<sup>138</sup> Philo also alludes to the psalm as simply the 'Great Song' (ἐν ᾧδῇ μεγάλῃ – *Det.* 30.114),<sup>139</sup> the lack of further explication suggesting both the Song's widespread familiarity and its negation of a requisite Mosaic provenance. The context is Philo's affirmation of wise men being replenished by the products of the field, a milieu entirely different from the warning aspect of Deuteronomy. One might also include 2 Macc 7:6 in such distinctions, since the Song seems to be used here (implicitly) as a song of protest issued by the martyrs; the Song εἰς μαρτύριον has shifted from being a condemnation of apostate Israel to a celebration of their faithful martyrdom and divine vindication.<sup>140</sup> Horbury ventures that "the greater Song with its martyr-links

---

<sup>137</sup> Steven Weitzman, "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1996): 55, his emphasis.

<sup>138</sup> Weitzman, "Allusion," 55 notes the similar designation of the Song in Targum Onqelos. The warning aspect, however, is not completely lost in Philo; Moses still reproves them for past sin (ἐλεγχοί) and admonishes them in the present (νουθεσίᾳ) – *Virt.* 75. Likewise, Onqelos advocates that the "song of praise" still functions as a witness against the Israelites.

<sup>139</sup> Philo refers to Deut 32 likewise in *Leg* 3.105, but here ascribes the content to Moses; in *Plant.* 59 it is the "Greater Song," the lesser one being Exod 15, which, according to Josephus, shared the "hexameter rhythm" (*Ant.* 2.346). See H. St J. Thackeray, *Josephus, the Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929), 91.

<sup>140</sup> The appeal to Deut 32 may extend beyond just this verse: "it can plausibly be argued that a considerable part of Deuteronomy 32, especially vv. 35-43, underlies much of what is said in chapter

was one of the early church's favourite texts,"<sup>141</sup> and such martyr links may have occasioned Hebrews' own preference for Deut 32, especially bearing in mind the letter's 'persecuted-but-not-yet-martyred' backdrop (Heb 10: 32-35, 12:3-4, 13:13).<sup>142</sup>

Particularly significant is the liturgical context to which the Song is transferred, within both Jewish and Christian communities.<sup>143</sup> The multiplicity of voices and protagonists in the song (heaven, earth, Israel, YHWH, enemies) renders its usage convivial for a corporate sung context.<sup>144</sup> Within early Christian circles, Rev 15:3-4 may evidence Deut 32's liturgical usage, with the song of the martyrs described as τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωϋσέως. Although the words and spirit of the ᾠδὴ approximate more to Exod 15, "the song sung by the victorious martyrs echoes and parallels that of Deut 32."<sup>145</sup> Deuteronomy 32's presence in the Odes text of Codex Alexandrinus also supports this liturgical function, but it remains unclear as to how early that psalmic corpus was available. That said, other songs found in the Odes (particularly the Song of the Sea and the Habakkuk psalm) exhibit a similar familiarity within Second Temple Judaism, suggesting that the Odes corpus represents a later witness to an earlier choral tradition for such texts, independent of their canonical context.<sup>146</sup> Liturgical usage is also evident at Qumran, where the presence of Deut 32 in a phylactery (4QPhyl<sup>N</sup>) testifies to some form of liturgical/devotional function, as does the song's existence as an excerpted text, with 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> attesting to the independent existence of the Song in the community.<sup>147</sup> It is

---

7 (i.e. of 2 Macc) as a whole" – Andrew Chester, "Citing the Old Testament," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 153.

<sup>141</sup> William Horbury, "Septuagintal and New Testament Conceptions of Church," in *A Vision for the Church: Studies in Early Christian Ecclesiology in Honour of J.P.M. Sweet* (ed. Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Michael B. Thompson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 2. Thomas, "Citations," 304 notes that Song was used as part of the Easter vigil.

<sup>142</sup> It is also interesting that the Song is given in relation to events in the last days (ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν – Deut 31:29), Hebrews' own temporal framework (1:1-2).

<sup>143</sup> See Horbury, "Septuagintal," 1-17 on how the Song's usage might reveal the praxis and composition of a Christian worshipping community.

<sup>144</sup> Thiessen, "Form," 414-19 proposes a breakdown of how the Song might have functioned within the choral liturgy.

<sup>145</sup> Horbury, "Septuagintal," 2n1; see also Bell, *Provoked*, 265-66, G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 792-800. For a dissenting view see Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 297.

<sup>146</sup> See Heinrich Schneider, "Die Biblischen Oden im Christlichen Altertum," *Bib* 30 (1949): 30-34.

possible that this 'separate' status of Deut 32 was in obedience to Deut 31's requirement for its regular reading and hearing. The presence of Deut 32 in 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> alongside the Shema and Deut 8 (potentially the grace before meals) also suggests that the Song perhaps formed part of some liturgy within the community.<sup>148</sup>

Beyond Qumran, Josephus records that the Song was kept in the temple (*Ant.* 4.303), presumably for choral purposes.<sup>149</sup> Rabbinic evidence also attests that the Song operated as a liturgical text recited by the Levites in the Temple on the Sabbath (*b. Ros Has* 31a; *y. Meg.* 3:6, 74b).<sup>150</sup> The former asserts that the song was read, along with Exod 15, in the Temple on the Sabbath and at the additional sacrifice, with the tradition additionally enacted in the synagogues. Weinfeld suggests the Song was also recited in the Ma'amadot, where a group of representatives prayed in the daily service of the Temple.<sup>151</sup> One interesting liturgical application of the Song is its putative association with the celebration of the Day of Atonement (DA), particularly so in view of Hebrews' substantial adoption of DA imagery. A possible reference to Deut 32 is found in 1Q34/1Q34<sup>bis</sup>, where the phrase כְּרִבִּים עַל־י occurs (cf. Deut 32:2) in association with the reference to Yom Kippur, though the fragmentary nature of the text precludes too much certainty.<sup>152</sup>

The Song's frequent citation in the NT confirms this picture of its familiarity in contemporary Judaism.<sup>153</sup> Albl opines that it operated as a potential source of *testimonia* material for the early church and might have formed part of a Christian liturgical or catechetical 'extract collection'. Paul quotes the Song three times (Rom

---

<sup>147</sup> Deuteronomy 32 is also found excerpted in 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> and 4QDeut<sup>k1</sup>.

<sup>148</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, "Grace after Meals in Qumran," *JBL* 111 (1992): 428-29.

<sup>149</sup> Thackeray, *Josephus*, 90-91.

<sup>150</sup> Weinfeld, "Grace," 428.

<sup>151</sup> Weinfeld, "Grace," 428-29.

<sup>152</sup> See Dominique Barthélemy, J. T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 136, 153-54. Manfred R. Lehmann, "'Yom Kippur' in Qumran," *RevQ* 3 (1961): 121 speculates that 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> may have functioned as a Yom Kippur prayer book.

<sup>153</sup> In view of this abundant contemporary attestation, we concur with Wagner's surprise at Stanley's contention that Deut 32:43 is an "oblique" verse to be cited by Paul. See J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans* (NovTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 23; Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 17.

10:19, 12:19, 15:10) and alludes to it at least twice (Rom 11:11, 11:14),<sup>154</sup> causing Hays to propose: "Deuteronomy 32 contains Romans *in nuce*."<sup>155</sup> The situational perspective of Deut 32 as a 'witness' text preached at entry to the land is not its primary significance, in Romans at least; the Song's "reminiscence of the wilderness tradition" comes more to the fore in 1 Cor 10. Hays suggests that 10:22 echoes Deut 32:21, whilst the depiction of Christ as the rock (10:4) corresponds to the Song's same characterisation of God (32:4).<sup>156</sup> Instead, within Romans, Deut 32's placement of Jew and Gentile on equal footing is the prevailing motif, part of the universal message of salvation by which Israel is humbled to bring in the Gentiles alongside the restoration of Israel (especially 32:43). Hays summarizes: "God's covenant with Israel is read – in the light of clues from Isaiah 40-55 and Deuteronomy 32 – as part of his larger narrative design to raise up a people to declare his praise, called from among the Gentiles as well as the Jews."<sup>157</sup> Richard Bell draws similar conclusions to Hays vis-à-vis the Song's function as a source for Pauline *Heilsgeschichte* and the ingrainings of the Gentiles into the people of God. In particular, he points to the Song's jealousy motif as germane to YHWH's dealings with Israel, such that both Jew and Gentile are shown mercy, despite their disobedience. Bell summarizes his thesis as follows:

The Song ... portrays the history of Israel: her election, fall, judgement and salvation. It is also a song about what role the Gentiles play in the history of Israel. The Song would therefore be an ideal quarry from which Paul could excavate for ideas about God's strange ways with Israel and the nations.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> Bell, *Provoked*, 269. He notes that, within the NT as a whole, Deut 32 is cited 6 times (Rom 10:19, 12:19, 15:10; Heb 1:6, 10:30a, 10:30b) and alluded to at least 11 times (Matt 17:17, Luke 9:41, Acts 2:40, Rom 11:11, 11:14; 1 Cor 10:20, 22; Phil 2:15; Rev 6:10, 19:2, 15:3-4). He ventures that Paul is the "most extensive user of the Song", but, as our subsequent research will show, Hebrews actually bears this mantle.

<sup>155</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 164. James M. Scott, "Paul's Use of Deuteronomistic Tradition," *JBL* 112 (1993): 647n9 opines that it is Rom 9-11 *in nuce*. See also Bell, *Provoked*, 269-82; Waters, *Paul*, 131-232. In a subsequent work, Hays restates his case: "to say that Deut 32 contains Romans *in nuce* is to say that Deuteronomy is to Romans as the acorn is to the oak tree" – Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 181.

<sup>156</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 94. He recognizes that the Rock imagery would be incomprehensible to an audience raised on the LXX, since the metaphor is omitted there. Hays' concern is Paul's own familiarity with the MT tradition, not that of his readers.

<sup>157</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 183-84.

<sup>158</sup> Bell, *Provoked*, 281.

As Hebrews also cites two of the verses quoted by Paul within the Rom 9-11 discourse (32:35; 32:43), it is possible that Hebrews too may be operating within a broader Deut 32 matrix, especially if, as Hays ventures of 1 Cor 10, Paul is also "reading the wilderness story through the lens of Deuteronomy 32."<sup>159</sup>

## **2.4 Conclusion**

As a minimum, the Song is a familiar text for the broad Jewish community, whatever its particular usage and context. Sung in isolation, it may function as a hymn of praise, a celebration of divine vindication and supremacy. Yet, as we have seen, this exaltation context need not exclude the 'witness' orientation accorded to the Song in Deut 31. Within the canonical text, the Song's message is mixed, a confident assertion of YHWH's faithfulness combined with a sobering warning of the implications of Israel's faithlessness. It remains to be seen which aspects Hebrews develops.

---

<sup>159</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 94.

### **Chapter 3: Deuteronomic Citation in the text of Hebrews**

In this chapter, we examine Hebrews' specific citations of Deuteronomy. For heuristic purposes, we consider them within four categories: quotations, strong allusions, echoes and narrative allusions. For each citation, we attempt to justify its validity and significance, considering the pertinent textual and lexical issues, before proceeding to discuss the effect of the intertextual exchange and its contribution to Hebrews' overall paraenetic argument.

#### **3.1 The Deuteronomic Quotations in Hebrews**

##### **3.1.1 Heb 1:6 (Deut 32:43 LXX)**

Along with 13:5, the source of the quotation in Heb 1:6 is perhaps the most contested in the whole letter.<sup>1</sup> Whilst 1:6 itself possesses no significant variants, the cited text lacks an absolute match within the Göttingen LXX. The options for the source are threefold: Ps 96:7 LXX, Deut 32:43 LXX and Ode 2:43.

##### **3.1.1.1 Heb 1:6 & Ps 96:7 LXX**

<b>Ps 96:7 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 1:6</b>
προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ	καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ

Arguments for the Ps 96:7 LXX source are not without merit and found convincing by several scholars.<sup>2</sup> The presence of all the key composite words, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Fred B. Craddock, "Hebrews," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (ed. Leander Keck; Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 29 notes of 1:6's introduction and quotation: "each are full of ambiguities."

<sup>2</sup> George H. Guthrie, *Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 67; Motyer, "Psalm," 18-19; N. T. Wright, *Hebrews for Everyone* (London: SPCK, 2003), 7; Thomas Kem Oberholtzer, "The Warning Passages in Hebrews, Pt 1: The Eschatological Salvation of Hebrews 1:5-2:5," *BSac* 145 (1988): 86-87; Leonard, *Authorship*, 223; Jean Calvin, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter* (trans. William B. Johnston; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1963), 10-13; Attridge, "Psalms," 201 suggests that the "citation ... clearly displays the tendency of the Greek translation of Ps. 97:7." Cadwallader, "Correction," 262 traces how aspects of the textual tradition adapted 1:6 towards Ps 96 LXX, yet concedes that the Psalm was probably not the source of the citation (285).



exhortation to the angels of God to worship 'him' and the specific association of angels with worship all commend the possibility of the Psalm providing the *Vorlage* for the Hebrews quotation. The Psalms are a favoured source for Hebrews, particularly in 1:5-14, and the rest of the Psalm resonates with other parts of the epistle. The theophanic imagery of 96:2-5 (especially νεφέλη καὶ γνόφος – 96:2; cf. Heb 12:18) and the presence of divine fire (96:3; cf. Heb 12:18-19, 29) both recall the elemental language of 12:18-29; 96:8 also shares Hebrews' relocation to Zion as the source of confidence for the worshipping community and the locus of divine judgment (cf. Heb 12:22-24). The reference to οἰκουμένη (96:4) brings a key term of Heb 1:6 into close proximity to the mooted source of the quotation, particularly noteworthy because οἰκουμένη and γῆ subsequently play off each other in 96:4b; it is the latter, rather than former, that is shaken (96:4; cf. Heb 12:26-27).<sup>3</sup> The Psalm's title (96:1) embraces the Davidic context established in Heb 1:5, and continues the logic initiated in that verse. The establishment of the king on Zion and the call to worship him is premised upon the king's 'land' being established (96:1).<sup>4</sup>

Such impressive similarities, however, cannot disregard the significant textual variation between Heb 1:6/Ps 96:7. The loss of the definite article οἱ is marginal and the shift from προσκυνήσατε to προσκυνησάτωσαν is less significant when set against Ps 97:7/4QDeut<sup>a</sup> 32:43b.<sup>5</sup> The difference might be occasioned by a misread of αἰσχυθήτωσαν in 96:7, or, although lacking any textual evidence, a parallel form προσκυνησάτωσαν could have existed in Hebrews' source text. More problematic, however, are the other citational differences, especially the change from αὐτοῦ to θεοῦ. It remains difficult to see the appeal to Hebrews of ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ as its format prevents the author from exploiting the implied distinction between αὐτῷ and θεοῦ. Equally difficult is the presence of καί (1:6); it fulfils no rhetorical purpose in the citation and is essentially superfluous.<sup>6</sup> It is possible that καί is not

---

<sup>3</sup> Ἐσαλεύθη (96:4 LXX) is passive, but active in the MT (לָחַח – Ps 97:4), rendering the former closer to the imagery of Heb 12:26-27.

<sup>4</sup> Motyer, "Psalm," 18-19.

<sup>5</sup> Since Ps 97:7 MT is identical to 4QDeut<sup>a</sup> 32:43b (the introductory waw aside), with both second and third person imperative deemed equally acceptable Greek renderings (i.e. Ps 96:7/Deut 32:43 LXX), the difference between the respective forms is perhaps less contentious. Hebrews alters the person of a verb elsewhere (cf. 13:5), but such a change yields no apparent benefit in 1:6. Therefore, applying a general rule of thumb, were Ps 96:7 Hebrews' *Vorlage*, the change of person would be classified as a textual – rather than exegetical – variant.

<sup>6</sup> Gareth Lee Cockerill, "Hebrews 1:6: Source and Significance," *BBR* 9 (1999): 52; Herbert Braun, *An die Hebräer* (HNT 14; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1984), 37; Schröger, *Verfasser*, 47. A cursory

part of the quotation, but rather modifies λέγει, emphasizing the Scriptural attestation of the Son's supremacy (λέγει καὶ would parallel εἶπέν (1:5); 'he said/he also says'). Nowhere else in the letter, though, does Hebrews use καὶ in this way, preferring instead the modifier πάλιν (1:5, 2:13, 10:30). The most persuasive argument against reading καὶ with λέγει is its inclusion in Deut 32:43 LXX, a more compelling source for the quotation.

### **3.1.1.2 Heb 1:6 & Deut 32:43 LXX**

<b>Deut 32:43b LXX<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>Heb 1:6</b>
καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ	καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ

Deuteronomy 32:43 LXX is the source text preferred by the majority of scholars.<sup>8</sup> It preserves the elusive καὶ and, unlike Ps 96:7, renders the imperative in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person form. The Song's hymnic characterisation also contextualizes it well within the predominance of psalmic quotations in 1:5-14. Yet Deut 32:43 is itself also problematic and Bruce's suggestion that "there can be little doubt that it was from that place (i.e. Deut 32:43) that the writer made the citation"<sup>9</sup> is overly optimistic. Two issues must be addressed. First, the LXX text is substantially longer than its MT

---

review of the relevant literature reveals no variants of Ps 97:6b with an initial waw/καὶ. Cf. Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Bible*, 544; Benjamin Kennicott et al., *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum: Cum Variis Lectionibus* (2vols.; Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1776).

<sup>7</sup> Both Wevers and Rahlfs support this reading. The presence of ἄγγελοι in other textual witnesses (F, N) probably attests to an attempt to conform the LXX to either Heb 1:6 or Odes 2:43.

<sup>8</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 51; George Wesley Buchanan, *To the Hebrews: Translation, Comment and Conclusions* (AB 36; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972), 15-17; R. McL Wilson, *Hebrews* (NCB Commentary; Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1987), 40; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 118-19; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.18; Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 112; L. D. Hurst, "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2," in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird* (ed. L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright; Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 159; Jean Héring, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (CNT XII; Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1954), 25; Cockerill, "Source," 53; Braun, *Hebräer*, 37; Albert Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1-2* (Paris: Cerf, 1969), 160-69.

<sup>9</sup> Alexander Balmain Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. The First Apology for Christianity. An Exegetical Study* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899), 50-51.

equivalent, raising concerns about its accuracy or integrity.<sup>10</sup> Second, the disparity between υἱοὶ θεοῦ (Deut 32:43) and ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (Heb 1:6) is disconcerting in the context of a pericope whose overarching theme is the Son's superiority over angels.

The first concern has been partly assuaged by the publication of 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>,<sup>11</sup> whose reading of 32:43 is longer than its masoretic counterpart.<sup>12</sup> The Qumran testimony also undermines the notion that Heb 1:6 presents a composite quotation (a hybrid of Ps 96 and Deut 32:43);<sup>13</sup> 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> 32:43 has sufficient affinity with Heb 1:6 to negate any need to appeal to the Psalm. The similarities between the texts may be demonstrated as follows:

	MT	4QDeut <sup>q</sup> 32:43	LXX
a		הַרְנִינוּ שָׁמַיִם עִמּוֹ	εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοί ἅμα αὐτῷ
b		וְהִשְׁתַּחוּ לֹו כָּל אֱלֹהִים	καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ
c	הַרְנִינוּ גּוֹיִם עִמּוֹ		εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ
d			καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ
e	כִּי דָם עֲבָדָיו יָקוּם	כִּי דָם בְּנָיו יָקוּם	ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται καὶ

<sup>10</sup> C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), 156 describes the citation as "interpolated by the LXX into the text of Deut 32:43." Leonard, *Authorship*, 398 rejects Deut 32:43 because of "the difficulty attendant in supposing a citation of the text where the reading ἄγγελοι is not certain."

<sup>11</sup> The *editio princeps* is Ulrich et al., *DJD 14*, 137-42, but the fragment was first discussed by Patrick W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumran," *BASOR* 136 (December 1954): 12-15.

<sup>12</sup> Hence Lindars' comment (*Apologetic*, 211n3) that 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> does not affect decisions about the source of the quotation seems questionable in the circumstances.

<sup>13</sup> The 'composite' argument is made by Thompson, *Beginnings*, 132n17; Hans Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief* (HNT 14; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1931), 15; William Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951), 92; Hans-Friedrich Weiss, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 161; J. Daryl Charles, "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews," *JETS* 33 (1990): 176n31.

			ἐκδικήσει
f	ונקם ישיב לצריו	ונקם ישיב לצריו	καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς
g		ולמשנאיו ישלם	καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀνταποδώσει
h	וכפר אדמתו עמו	וכפר אדמת עמו	καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

The LXX broadly shares abg with the Qumran tradition, c with MT, and efh with both (though e is closer to Qumran than MT). The d cola has no extant textual source. As it varies from Qumran and MT beyond just 43d (the additional καὶ ἐκδικήσει, 32:43e), the LXX is more likely an amalgam of the respective traditions, rather than original.<sup>14</sup> Our task here is not to revisit the extensive debate on 32:43's text history, but rather to determine which of MT and 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> is primary.

The existence of a proto-MT text chronologically prior to the Qumran material is certainly possible and some symmetrical aspects of Deut 32:43 MT suggest an original coherence.<sup>15</sup> P.M. Bogaert argues for the shorter, 4-cola (MT) original on the grounds that a text of the Law would only be enlarged (and not curtailed) over time.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, it is feasible that additions to a 4-line text (lines b and g) might originate from Ps 97:7 and Deut 32:41 respectively. Van der Kooij disagrees, proposing that the pre-masoretic version of Deut 32:43 comprised 6 cola, akin to 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>. He contends that the alteration of a legal text for stylistic reasons has precedent<sup>17</sup> and that Ps 97:7 could equally be the recipient rather than the

<sup>14</sup> Cockerill, "Source," 57 notes that the Qumran and MT versions differ beyond merely the 'b' equivalent, thus lessening the likelihood that the difference between MT/Qumran is occasioned by a rogue influence of Ps 96(97):7. It is preferable to see Qumran and MT as reflecting two different streams, with the LXX influenced more by the former than the latter.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the עמו־נקם־נקם־עמו chiasm – McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 450.

<sup>16</sup> Pierre-M. Bogaert, "Les Trois Rédactions Conservées et la Forme Originale de L'envoi du Cantique de Moïse (Dt 32,43)," in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), 329-40. Bogaert's thesis of a H\* source behind both Q and the MT is not persuasive. His suggestion that elohim was in the first line as the agent of the rejoicing has little, if any, grounds.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Gen 46:20. In Gen 46, as in Deut 32, the consequent number of verse lines totals 70, equivalent to the number of the Sons of Israel (cf. Deut 32:8-9) – Arie van der Kooij, "The Ending of the Song of Moses: On the Pre-Masoretic Version of Deut 32:43," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of*

provider of the shared text.<sup>18</sup> Alternatively, Skehan suggests (in 1951, before his publication of 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>), that 32:43 MT appeared to have lost a hemstich and thus the verse was in some way incomplete or deficient. He notes the absence of an exhortation to praise God parallel to the opening **הֲרַנִּינוּ גוֹיִם עִמּוֹ**; without such a command, the text is unbalanced and lacks any worship element (cf. Deut 32:3).<sup>19</sup> The reference to 'heavens' in 43a also provides a fitting inclusio with Deut 32:1, an option not offered by the MT text.<sup>20</sup> On such grounds, especially in view of the Qumran witness, it is conceivable, indeed likely, that a 32:43b or 32:43d type exhortation was original to the Greek tradition, and familiar to both the author and audience of Hebrews. Justin knows such a text,<sup>21</sup> and testifies to it as Scripture; Howard's contention that a Hebrew text was the source *Vorlage* is an unnecessary recourse.<sup>22</sup>

The second issue is more problematic. Even allowing for a six-cola Deut 32:43 (i.e. abefgh), **ἄγγελοι θεου** is found in 43d, not 43b, and with a different verb **ἐνισχυσάτωσαν**. In a detailed textual study of Deut 32:43, Glenn Cockerill concludes that **ἄγγελοι θεοῦ** was actually the old Greek reading of 32:43b, and was likewise the text available to, and subsequently used, by Hebrews.<sup>23</sup> Assuming Qumran primacy, Cockerill concurs that 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> 32:43b provides the Hebrew behind the Greek tradition;<sup>24</sup> the key issue becomes that tradition's rendering of **כָּל אֱלֹהִים** (4QDeut<sup>q</sup> 32:43b). Since the LXX never translates **אֱלֹהִים** with **υἱοὶ**

---

*C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 100.

<sup>18</sup> Kooij, "Ending," 98.

<sup>19</sup> Skehan, "Structure," 153-63. He differs from van der Kooij by arguing for a 4-stich original (effectively adeh), with dittographical influence of 32:41 and Ps 96:7 subsequently brought to bear. See also Alexander Rofé, "The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:43)," in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 164-72, whose 4-stich conclusion resembles that of Skehan.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Sanders, *Provenance*, 250, for whom such a "beautiful inclusion" is a compelling reason for Qumranic primacy.

<sup>21</sup> *Dial.* 130.1.

<sup>22</sup> Howard, "Hebrews," 215.

<sup>23</sup> Hence Cockerill, "Source," 56, following Skehan, "Structure," 153-63, concludes that a line has dropped out of MT 32:43, an equivalent to 32:43d LXX, and a parallel to 32:43b LXX.

<sup>24</sup> This starting point is significant. Bogaert, "Trois Rédactions," 336-37 begins with the evidence of **υἱοὶ θεου** in 32:43b. As, with Cockerill, the phrase never renders **אֱלֹהִים**, he concludes that LXX's *Vorlage* must have read **בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים**.

θεοῦ, but does so with both ἄγγελοι (Pss 8:5, 138:1) and ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ (Ps 96:7), Cockerill proposes that the original reading of 32:43b is more likely ἄγγελοι θεοῦ than υἱοὶ θεοῦ.<sup>25</sup> He further contends that a translator of 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> 32:43 would not have rendered two different Hebrew words אֱלֹהִים (32:43b) and בְּנֵי (in 32:43e) with the same Greek word υἱοὶ.

Cockerill's proposal is certainly plausible, though one could equally argue its converse. The causal relationship referenced within the כִּי/ὅτι clause might ascribe semantic parallelism, rather than difference, to אֱלֹהִים and בְּנֵי, the different words occasioned by poetic style. He is also forced to conclude that scribal error ultimately shifts ἄγγελοι to 32:43d and υἱοὶ to 32:43b,<sup>26</sup> a recourse that may weaken his overall position. Katz avoids such an eventuality, proposing that, because of concern about divine childbearing, 32:43d (ἄγγελοι θεοῦ) forms the earliest stratum; υἱοὶ θεοῦ (32:43b) is a later addition when such unease had abated. He restores the primitive text to lines 32:43a and 32:43d; Heb 1:6 represents 32:43d, with the correct 'worship' verb replacing the odd 'strengthen' one.<sup>27</sup>

Katz's view would be more persuasive but for the variant readings of the final clause of Deut 32:8 LXX. Rahlfs here reads ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, whereas Wevers appeals to the priority of υἱοὶ θεοῦ as evidenced by 848. If such testimony is heeded, Katz's justification is turned on its head, i.e. υἱοὶ has priority and is emended to ἄγγελοι because of theological concerns. However, it is entirely possible both that 32:43 also experienced the shift from υἱοὶ θεοῦ to ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, and that such emendations were already present in Hebrews' *Vorlage*. Hebrews appears familiar with 32:8 (cf. Heb 2:5), and, as Justin also juxtaposes the two texts,<sup>28</sup> it is conceivable that he shared with Hebrews an LXX exhibiting ἄγγελοι θεοῦ in both 32:8 and 32:43b. Furthermore, the close relationship between ἄγγελοι θεοῦ and υἱοὶ θεοῦ is evidenced by their parallelism in 32:43 LXX and their common rendering of similar

---

<sup>25</sup> Kooij, "Ending," 99, although favouring Qumran primacy, still considers υἱοὶ θεοῦ the original Greek reading of 32:43b.

<sup>26</sup> Cockerill, "Source," 60.

<sup>27</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 217-19.

<sup>28</sup> References to 32:8 and 32:43 appear several times in *Dial* 130.3-131.1

Hebrew expressions. בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, for example, is rendered by οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (Gen 6:2, Gen 6:4) and אֱלֹהִים by ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (Gen. 6:2a, Job 1:6, 2:1).<sup>29</sup>

Cogent arguments exist for either reading, and one must remain agnostic as to whether the Old Greek 32:43b rendered ἄγγελοι or υἱοὶ. However, as כָּל אֱלֹהִים is more likely rendered with ἄγγελοι than υἱοὶ, and as 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> 32:43b parallels Ps 96:7 LXX's supposed Hebrew *Vorlage* (i.e. Ps 97:6 MT), in which אֱלֹהִים is rendered by οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, the evidence perhaps weighs heavier on the angelic translation. Bearing in mind this complex textual minefield, were the argument purely on linguistic grounds, one might be obliged to remain similarly agnostic vis-à-vis the source of the quotation in Heb 1:6. The atonement language of Deut 32:43h, however, resonates with the prevailing message of Hebrews,<sup>30</sup> and Bauckham likewise suggests that Deut 32:43's broad context is germane to 1:6's christological import:

(I)t is because the author of Hebrews (or the tradition he uses) knew its context and understood Deut 32:43 to be part of the divine speech that begins at v.39 that he knew the 'him' of v43a had to be someone distinguishable from God but someone to whom worship is due. It is notable that a divine speech which begins with *the* (final, culminating, most solemn) declaration by God of his divine uniqueness (Deut 32:39 ... ) should be understood to include this God's command to the angels to worship someone distinguished from himself.<sup>31</sup>

The source text for Heb 1:6, therefore, makes most sense as the Greek text of Deut 32:43 to which 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> 32:43 was the Hebrew equivalent. The LXX text is

---

<sup>29</sup> Cockerill, "Source," 59. Hurst, *Background*, 46 is sceptical of such equivalence: "in his (i.e. Hebrews') bible, angels were never called sons." The textual evidence, however, blurs the difference between the two phrases, and Hurst's contention that the ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ of Ps 88:7 LXX are Israelites is difficult in view of the references to οἱ οὐρανοὶ (88:6) and ἐν νεφέλαις (88:7). See Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (WUNT 2/70; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995), 121n187.

<sup>30</sup> Atonement is made for the land (γῆ) rather than for sin, but such action could still be viewed christologically – cf. Michel, *Brief*, 111n5. Margaret Barker, *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God* (London: SPCK, 1992), 43-46 proposes that Deut 32:43 casts YHWH in the guise of high priest, particularly appropriate for Hebrews' broader purposes.

<sup>31</sup> Richard Bauckham, "Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North; JSNTSup 263; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 179n28.

closely allied to this Qumran tradition,<sup>32</sup> and is best seen as an expansion of that stream, subsequently incorporating elements derivative from the (proto-)MT tradition.<sup>33</sup>

### **3.1.1.3 Heb 1:6 & Odes 2:43 LXX**

Odes 2 is an almost verbatim borrowing of Deut 32 and attests its expansionistic LXX text-form. A few salient differences, however, remain; where Deut 32:43b has υἱοὶ θεοῦ, Ode 2:43b reads οἱ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, with the renderings reversed in 43d (Deut 32:43d lacks the article). Odes 2:43b therefore becomes the closest text to that cited in Heb 1:6, the only difference being the absence in 1:6 of the definite article (perhaps imported into Ode 2:43 under the influence of Ps 96 LXX).

Odes 2:43b LXX	Heb 1:6
καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ	καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ

This impressive similarity leads a number of scholars to concur that Odes 2:43 is the text cited in 1:6.<sup>34</sup> Against this conclusion, however, are questions of dating and availability to Hebrews' author;<sup>35</sup> the Odes corpus may have origins within synagogue or early Christian worship, but its earliest textual evidence (Codex Alexandrinus) derives from the fifth century, somewhat postdating Hebrews. Furthermore, although a distinct psalm in its own right, Odes 2 remains essentially a recapitulation of the pre-existent Deut 32, with both texts reflecting the same Greek

<sup>32</sup> Cockerill, "Source," 55. R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 112 rather sees three traditions in operation: MT, OG and 4QDeut: "Despite the obvious agreement between 4QDeut<sup>9</sup> and the OG in the exhortation 'And worship every god/all you gods', there is not a direct dependence of the one upon the other." McLay consequently argues that the OG version is the longest and the "original."

<sup>33</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 119: "The most probable explanation is that he is quoting Dt. 32:43b in a form not now directly attested, but to which 4QDeuteronomy gives indirect support."

<sup>34</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 28; Steyn, "Quest," 266-68; McLay, *Use*, 110-13; Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 22-23; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 98; Thomas, "Citations," 304. McLay confusingly refers to the Odes as the 'Odes of Solomon,' generally regarded as a different corpus of texts (and premises his argument on Charlesworth's dating of the Solomonic Odes).

<sup>35</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 118 discards the claims of Ode. 2:43 on this basis.



tradition and potentially sourced from the same Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>36</sup> Whilst the Odes text may be the format with which Hebrews is familiar, it is essentially a secondary concept that reflects a prior tradition which it does not alter in any substantial manner. Justin cites the text (in the same form as Ode. 2:43), but does so attributing it to Moses, thereby retaining its Deuteronomic milieu.<sup>37</sup> Perhaps the key testimony of Odes 2 is its demonstration of the Song's liturgical application within the early Judeo-Christian communities. Its association with the worship context may explain both its familiarity to Hebrews' author and its suitability for an epistle steeped in liturgical and cultic language.<sup>38</sup>

### **3.1.1.4 The Function of Deut 32:43 in Heb 1:6**

Hebrews 1:6 forms part of 1:5-14, a balanced discourse on the Son's superiority over angels. The pericope is neatly structured with three Son-Angel, Angel-Son, Son-Angel comparisons (1:5-6, 1:7-12, 1:13-14),<sup>39</sup> the phrase τίνι/τίνα .... τῶν ἀγγέλων marking an inclusio for the argument.<sup>40</sup> Hebrews 1:6 parallels 1:5; where the latter is concerned with the inheritance and authority of the Son, the former infers the angels' inferiority on the grounds that they worship the πρωτότοκος.<sup>41</sup> Unlike the other six quotations in 1:5-14, the citation in 1:6 is given a contextual, explanatory gloss that breaks up the otherwise pithy catena; Deut 32:43 is not set forth solely as a quasi-messianic proof text whose meaning would be self-evident to the audience.<sup>42</sup> Whilst angelic worship of the Son would presumably provide ample justification for filial superiority, one must take seriously the text's interpretative cues

---

<sup>36</sup> Cockerill, "Source," 52.

<sup>37</sup> Justin, *Dial* 130.1. The reference to Moses as πιστοῦ θεράποντος may also reflect familiarity with Heb 3:5.

<sup>38</sup> Steyn, "Quest," 263-71 and Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 57-60 conjecture that the quotations used by Hebrews are drawn from the synagogue liturgical cycle.

<sup>39</sup> Albert Vanhoye, *La Structure Littéraire de 'L'épître aux Hébreux'* (Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1976), 69-74.

<sup>40</sup> Wilfried Eisele, *Ein Unerschütterliches Reich: die Mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief* (BZNW 116; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 49.

<sup>41</sup> Πρωτότοκος is the inferred referent of αὐτῷ.

<sup>42</sup> In its original context the worship is directed at YHWH alone. However Deut 32:43's word order – i.e. the distance between αὐτῷ and θεοῦ – opens the possibility of a theological duality within the text. Cf. Thomas Francis Glasson, "Plurality of Divine Persons and the Quotations in Hebrews 1:6ff," *NTS* 12 (1966): 270-72.

and allow the introductory phrase to interpret the quotation's function. Three issues require resolution:<sup>43</sup> the use of πάλιν, the concept of πρωτότοκος, and the nature of the οἰκουμένη. The interpretation of these terms determines the event presupposed in 1:6 – creation,<sup>44</sup> the incarnation,<sup>45</sup> baptism,<sup>46</sup> the ascension/exaltation<sup>47</sup> or the parousia.<sup>48</sup>

Πάλιν has been read in four different ways. Three of these may be construed as citational formulae, or as operating as modifiers to the formulae. In these senses, πάλιν either modifies λέγει ('he also says'),<sup>49</sup> reinforces the adversative δὲ ('but on the other hand')<sup>50</sup> or stands alone as a straight introductory formula ('again'; cf. 1:5).<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> So Vanhoye, *Situation*, 151.

<sup>44</sup> A potential option for Eisele, *Unerschütterliches*, 50, but not endorsed by the majority of scholars.

<sup>45</sup> A. Bruce, *Epistle*, 54; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.17; Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 56; H. W. Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: A&C Black, 1964), 45-46; Synge, *Hebrews*, 4; Robert P. Gordon, *Hebrews* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 43; Donald Guthrie, *Hebrews* (TNTC; Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983), 74; Charles, "Angels," 174; Robert Gerald Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man a Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 246; George B. Caird, "Son by Appointment," in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke* (ed. William C. Weinrich; Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1984), 75-76.

<sup>46</sup> Bateman, *Early*, 222. This option, however, is generally absent elsewhere in the literature, and is found unconvincing on the same grounds as the incarnation option.

<sup>47</sup> George Johnston, "Οἰκουμένη and κόσμος in the New Testament," *NTS* 10 (1964): 354; Albert Vanhoye, "L'οἰκουμένη dans L'Épître aux Hébreux," *Bib* 45 (1964): 250-53; David Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 214n19; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 58; Andriessen, "Teneur," 293-304; Lane, *Hebrews*, 27; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 117-18; Koester, *Hebrews*, 192; John P. Meier, "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14," *Bib* 66 (1985): 507-11; Kenneth L. Schenck, "A Celebration of the Enthroned Son: The Catena of Hebrews 1," *JBL* 120 (2001): 477-79; Weiss, *Brief*, 162-63.

<sup>48</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 22-23; Braun, *Hebräer*, 36; Oberholtzer, "Warning, Pt1," 87; Marcus Dods et al., *The Expositor's Greek Testament IV* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), 254-55; Schröger, *Verfasser*, 51; Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 68; Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2vols.; London: SCM Press, 1952), 1.176; Michel, *Brief*, 113; Mathias Rissi, *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs: Ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und Seiner Leser* (WUNT 2/41; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987), 50; Kenneth S. Wuest, *Hebrews in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader* (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1947), 46-47; Héring, *L'Épître*, 25; William R. G. Loader, *Sohn und Hohepriester: Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes* (WMANT 53; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 23-25. Loader understands the 'first' introduction to be the ascension, when the Son's *Herrschaft* is assumed. Larry R. Helyer, "The Prototokos Title in Hebrews," *StudBT* 6, no. 2 (1976): 10-12 similarly favours the exaltation, but blurs the distinction between it and the parousia: "the introduction of Son into the 'age to come' begins at his ascension and is culminated at the parousia and visible reign" (12).

<sup>49</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.17.

<sup>50</sup> Vanhoye, *Situation*, 151-53.

The differences between these options should not be overstated, and the first and third options are almost interchangeable; the point is, that when so used, *πάλιν* does not modify the verb of the entry. This is the fourth option: *πάλιν* functions temporally, modifying *εἰσαγάγη*.<sup>52</sup> This translation was initially favoured by those who understood 1:6 as evidencing the parousia, as ὅταν with the aorist subjunctive (i.e. *εἰσαγάγη*) normally has a future domain (BDF §382). The construction, however, can also indicate a prior event (cf. 1 Cor 15:27) or one that happens repeatedly (cf. Matt 5:11),<sup>53</sup> and thus context rather than grammar must dictate its syntax.

Both citational and temporal options are plausible<sup>54</sup> and both occur elsewhere in the letter (1:5, 2:13, 10:30; cf. 4:7, 5:12, 6:6). The potential seven-fold symmetry of the introductory formulae in 1:5-14 adds weight to the citational option,<sup>55</sup> as does the quotation of Deut 32:43c in Rom 15:10, where *πάλιν* is used as an introductory formula with no temporal sense whatsoever.<sup>56</sup> Romans 15:10, however, places *πάλιν* directly prior to λέγει; one might expect such an ordering if the citational aspect was likewise intended in Heb 1:6, yet here the adverb is placed between ὅταν and *εἰσαγάγη*. In our view, word order and the otherwise potentially superfluous *δε* make the temporal rendering the more likely option;<sup>57</sup> at the very least, it is *possible* to read the phrase as 'when he again introduces ...'

Michel describes how the meaning of οἰκουμένη evolved to denote the known (Roman) world (cf. Luke 2:1, 4:5; Acts 11:28), and how, in Philo, the term identified "the inhabited land as distinct from uninhabited."<sup>58</sup> Scholars have

---

<sup>51</sup> James Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ICC 40; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924), 10; Gordon, *Hebrews*, 43; Lane, *Hebrews*, 26; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 56; Bateman, *Early*, 221; Koester, *Hebrews*, 192; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 39; Helyer, "Prototokos," 8.

<sup>52</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 22; Andriessen, "Teneur," 296-97; Michel, *Brief*, 112-13; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 96; Braun, *Hebräer*, 36.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 479: this situation is "a future contingency from the perspective of the time of the main verb."

<sup>54</sup> Citational aspect: NIV, NRSV, KJV, ESV, REB. Temporal: NASB.

<sup>55</sup> John P. Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14," *Bib* 66 (1985): 175 notes the use of seven introductory formulae for each citation: *πάλιν* (vv5-6), *μὲν ... δὲ* (vv7-8), *καί* (v10), *δὲ* (v13).

<sup>56</sup> Guthrie, *Hebrews (TNTC)*, 74-75.

<sup>57</sup> Although Meier, "Symmetry," 509 suggests Wis 14:1 offers a parallel construction that should not be read temporally.

<sup>58</sup> Otto Michel, "οἰκουμένη," *TDNT* 5:157-59.

consequently understood οἰκουμένη (1:6) as the human world, with the verse testifying to either the incarnation or parousia. In its only other usage in Hebrews (2:5), however, οἰκουμένη is delineated as both μέλλουσιν<sup>59</sup> and περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν. This latter modification implies a consistent meaning in both verses and the eschatological tone of μέλλουσιν warrants against reading 1:6 in incarnational terms.<sup>60</sup> Οἰκουμένη (1:6) is better understood as the heavenly arena; the verse speaks to the ascension and exaltation of the Son when he is reintroduced into the heavenly realm that he vacated during his earthly existence.<sup>61</sup> Vanhoye distinguishes between the created human world (κόσμος – 10:5) and the heavenly or real world (οἰκουμένη);<sup>62</sup> where 10:5 speaks to the incarnation, 1:6 and 2:5 both depict the ascension and exaltation. The letter elsewhere conceives of the heavenly realm in terms of the homeland of the people of God (11:13-16) and "a metaphorical reference to heaven as the truly civilized world is exactly the kind of thing we would expect from the author of Hebrews."<sup>63</sup>

Hebrews 1:6 is best viewed as a Deuteronomic gloss to a Deuteronomic quotation, one that appeals to the core Deuteronomic pre-entry posture.<sup>64</sup> Andriessen,<sup>65</sup> followed latterly by Lane,<sup>66</sup> argues that Heb 1:6's imagery conceives

---

<sup>59</sup> Philo summarizes Moses' singing of the Song as exhortations for the future (τὰ μέλλοντα – *Virt.* 75). This gives further support to Deut 32:43 being the text cited in Heb 1:6. Likewise, 32:43 is cast as the world to come in the Sifre.

<sup>60</sup> The strongest argument against the incarnation is that, rather than inviting angelic worship, it engendered humiliation, being 'made lower than angels' (Heb 2:7, 2:9). The worship of angels does not parallel the Lucan account of the worship of the πρωτότοκος (Luke 2:7, 2:13), since such worship was ultimately directed towards YHWH, not the first-born.

<sup>61</sup> The suggestion of Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 17-18 and, latterly Randall C. Gleason, "Angels and the Eschatology of Heb 1-2," *NTS* 49 (2003): 101n47, that οἰκουμένη should be defined as the messianic kingdom ruled from Jerusalem after the eschatological victory of the son is an interesting possibility, for it does retain the term's 'inhabited' dimension. However, Hebrews' overall perspective tends towards reading a heavenly, rather than earthly, destiny.

<sup>62</sup> Vanhoye, "L'οἰκουμένη," 248-53.

<sup>63</sup> Schenck, "Celebration," 478. This also correlates with the Deuteronomic expectation of Canaan, as a place that Israel will populate and inhabit; it will bear fruit for them, and be a place of safety and rest.

<sup>64</sup> Contra V. C. Pfitzner, *Hebrews* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 54.

<sup>65</sup> Andriessen, "Teneur," 293-304.

<sup>66</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 27: "If this introductory formula of v6 is read against this background (i.e. Israel's entry into the land), the component parts are all derived from Deuteronomy." See also Weiss, *Brief*, 163-64. David Ripley Worley, *God's Faithfulness to Promise: The Hortatory Use of Commissive Language in Hebrews* (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1998), 213-15 appeals to the promised land imagery, but conjectures that the imagery derives from a citation of Ps 96:7 LXX in Heb 1:6.

Israel's entry into the promised land as typology for the Son's re-entry into the heavenlies. Just as YHWH brought the original πρωτότοκος (Israel; cf. Exod 4:22) into the former ultimate destination (Canaan), so he has now brought the true πρωτότοκος (the Son) into heaven. Andriessen notes that ὅταν ... εἰσαγάγῃ occurs only twice in the LXX, both times in Deuteronomy, both times in the context of entry into Canaan (Deut 6:10, 11:29).<sup>67</sup> Οἰκουμένη itself is used of the promised land (Exod 16:35),<sup>68</sup> but being limited to the one example, some have found the parallel between οἰκουμένη and the promised land somewhat weak.<sup>69</sup> Philo, however, also uses οἰκουμένη in relation to Canaan when writing on Deut 30:12-14 (*Somn.* 2.180) and Hebrews probably finds the term similarly convivial, partly for its distinction from the uninhabited desert (for Deuteronomy, the antithesis of Canaan; cf. Deut 1:1, 1:19, 8:2, 8:15, 9:28), partly for its connotations of habitation (cf. Heb 12:22-24; the righteous are already assembled).

Both Deut 6:10 and 11:29 categorize the land as Israel's promised inheritance, strongly conversant with the specific κληρονόμος language of Heb 1 (1:2, 1:4, 1:14) and the broader inheritance context of 1:5 and 1:6.<sup>70</sup> Just as assembled Israel gathered on the threshold of their inheritance in Deuteronomy, so the audience of Hebrews are the ones who are equally τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν (1:14).<sup>71</sup> From the outset of the letter, the proto-Deuteronomic situation of the audience is established. The Son, the heir of all things (1:2), has gone ahead and received his inheritance, the heavenly throne (1:3); he is their πρόδρομος (6:20), the ἀρχηγός of the same salvation (2:10; cf. 12:2) to which the faithful are heirs. Seen in such terms, Heb 1:6/Deut 32:43 sits well with

---

<sup>67</sup> Andriessen, "Teneur," 296.

<sup>68</sup> Technically speaking, οἰκουμένη is an adjectival participle modifying γῆν, rather than the nominal form of Heb 1:6. But such usage is consistent with 1:6 since Exod 16:35 emphasizes the habitation of Canaan, as opposed to the desert experience of the previous forty years.

<sup>69</sup> Eisele, *Unerschütterliches*, 60.

<sup>70</sup> Dods et al., *Greek*, 254 notes of 1:6, quoting Rendall: it bespeaks the "introduction of an heir into his inheritance."

<sup>71</sup> There is perhaps a further correspondence between the description of angels as ministering/worshipping spirits (1:14) and their role as worshippers in 1:6. In both instances, the Son is comparatively portrayed as an heir. So Meier, "Symmetry," 519-20. Cf. *Virt.* 74: when Moses delivers the Song, the angels are described as ἄγγελοι λειτουργοί, perhaps derivative of the worshipping role ascribed to them in Deut 32:43b.

1:5, continuing the theme of the anointed king taking his inherited throne on Zion accompanied by the worship of the heavenly angels.<sup>72</sup>

Although it does not use the term πρωτότοκος<sup>73</sup> of Israel, Deuteronomy makes frequent mention of Israel's sonship (Deut 1:31, 8:5, 14:1, 32:5). Deuteronomy 32 is replete with language of Israel as the elect one of YHWH (32:9-10, 32:15, 32:19, 32:36, 32:43), with Israel elsewhere described as YHWH's inheritance (4:20). Πρωτότοκος in 1:6 may allude to Ps 88:28 LXX,<sup>74</sup> where the first-born is promised supremacy over the known world; this harmonizes well with the proto-messianic royal promises of 1:5.<sup>75</sup> But more likely, it prefaces the same phrase used later in Heb 12:23,<sup>76</sup> signalling the relationship between the original πρωτότοκος and those who have received such status as a consequence of his actions. The fate of the Son is intrinsically linked with that of the 'sons' (12:23).

This reading of the introductory clause in Heb 1:6 makes the case for Deut 32:43 being the cited text all the more persuasive. An avowedly Deuteronomic protasis qualifies and amplifies a Deuteronomic quotation, and thereby re-presents the Deuteronomic situation in a new context. Under the New Covenant, the Son is accorded worship, for it is he who has made possible access into the new Canaan.<sup>77</sup> Deuteronomy 32:43 is not merely a handy *testimonia* whose ambiguous αὐτῷ

---

<sup>72</sup> Michel, *Brief*, 112.

<sup>73</sup> On Hebrews' use of πρωτότοκος, see Helyer, "Prototokos," 3-22. He proposes that the term has apocalyptic origins, derived from the Hellenistic synagogue environment, and parallels Col 1:18 and Rev 1:5 in attesting to the vindication of the exalted Son. This understanding does not exclude our 'Israel as son' reading; Helyer himself suggests: "our author is drawing upon a tradition indebted to the New Exodus motif by designating Christians as first-born" (16).

<sup>74</sup> Bauckham, "Monotheism," 178.

<sup>75</sup> Frank-Lothar Hossfeld et al., *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51-100* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005) notes that 88:27-28 (MT 89:27-28) recalls the Davidic promises of Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14, both of which Heb 1:5 cites. This strengthens the case for the allusion to the psalm, though Hossfeld concurs that the term 'firstborn' had a broader reference to corporate Israel. V. Burch, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: its Sources and Message* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1936), 43-45 contends, following Briggs, that the reference to firstborn in the Psalm is ensconced within imagery associated with Deut 32, especially 32:6f and 32:15. Deuteronomy 32's sung nature meant "it was bound to beget songs." He argues that the first-born status derives not from Ps 89, but from the Song itself, which earmarks *Moses* as the firstborn, "nurtured" by YHWH, when forsaken by his mother.

<sup>76</sup> John M. Scholer, *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (JSNTSup 49; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 146; Helyer, "Prototokos," 12-16.

<sup>77</sup> It is possible that Hebrews construes the Song of Moses, especially vv35-43, messianically, articulating a 'general' figure who leads the new Israel into their new Canaan and brings about the destruction of her enemies. See William Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998), 80-81, 104.

enables a polysemic reading of a worshipped son. Instead, the text and its context evoke the language of the Mount Zion assembly,<sup>78</sup> which is presented as a new promised land. The Canaan entry that Deuteronomy set forth for assembled Israel becomes the paradigm for the exaltation of the ascended Christ and will likewise become the pattern for faithful believers (cf. 3:7-4:11).

### 3.1.2 Heb 10:30a (Deut 32:35)

Deut 32:35 MT	Deut 32:35 LXX <sup>79</sup>	Heb 10:30a
לִי נִקְם וְשָׁלֵם	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεως ἀνταποδώσω	ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω

The source of the quotation in Heb 10:30a is Deut 32:35, though in a Greek form no longer extant. The explicit τὸν εἰπόντα IF<sup>80</sup> denotes the presence of a quotation, and lacking any suitable alternative, Deut 32:35 appears the most likely candidate; the subsequent citation in Heb 10:30b is Deut 32:36 and Deut 32:35b (ἐγγὺς ἡμέρα) has perhaps already been alluded to in Heb 10:25 (ἐγγίζουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν).<sup>81</sup> Scholars sometimes aver that the text is closer to the MT than the LXX,<sup>82</sup> but any similarity extends only to the first part of the quotation; although ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις is a direct translation of לִי נִקְם, ἀνταποδώσω derives explicitly from the LXX and is unlikely to be a reading of the MT. Whilst it is possible that וְשָׁלֵם functions verbally (as its LXX rendering would attest),<sup>83</sup> the poetic style and the parallel with נִקְם

<sup>78</sup> Hence contra Son, *Zion*, 120-22, who views Deut 32:43 as essentially a 'Sinai' quotation. The thrust of Heb 1:6/Deut 32:43 is towards Canaan/Zion, not back to Sinai.

<sup>79</sup> SamP agrees with LXX rather than MT. לִי (32:35 MT) probably reflects corruption of an original לִי (cf. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ – LXX) which fits better contextually with the parallel לַעֲתָ (32:35). See Katz, "Quotations," 219-20; Michel, *Brief*, 354n1; Attridge, *Epistle*, 295.

<sup>80</sup> Gordon, *Hebrews*, 123-24 insightfully suggests that even the IF has ties with the Song of Moses. The confident οἶδαμεν ... εἰπόντα functions antithetically with Israel's ignorance of YHWH in the Song (32:28-29).

<sup>81</sup> See 3.3.4.

<sup>82</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 295; Steyn, "Quest," 269; Lindars, *Apologetic*, 245; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 152, Sowers, *Hermeneutics*, 76.

<sup>83</sup> This would require reading וְשָׁלֵם as a Piel infinitive (Wevers, *Notes*, 528). Contra Knight, *Song*, 103, there are no grounds to read 'shalom' ideas into the text.

make a nominal usage more likely;<sup>84</sup> this reduces any apparent similarity between Deut 32:35 MT and Heb 10:30. Purely on lexical comparison, there is no reason to conclude with Howard that Hebrews uses a Hebrew rather than Greek text at this point;<sup>85</sup> the citation varies equally from both textual streams.<sup>86</sup>

The cited lemma is possibly an amalgam of both MT and LXX texts,<sup>87</sup> but bearing in mind contemporary attestation elsewhere, it is more likely a (third) separate, but familiar, textual tradition.<sup>88</sup> Paul replicates the form in Rom 12:19, and the equivalent construction is evidenced in Targum Onkelos, suggestive perhaps of a common, possibly Hebrew, source.<sup>89</sup> Such targumic evidence also weighs against Hebrews being dependent upon Romans for the form of the citation,<sup>90</sup> the additional λέγει κύριος after the quotation in Rom 12:19 increasing the distinction between the two texts.<sup>91</sup> Bearing in mind Paul's usage, it is conceivable that the text originated from within the rabbinic schools,<sup>92</sup> but there is no other evidence to support this contention. It suffices to say that Heb 10:30a cites a Greek version of Deut 32:35, allied to, yet different from, both the MT and the LXX. This was in circulation and known to Hebrews' audience, possibly an oral tradition<sup>93</sup> or a catechetical form of the Song known to both Paul and Hebrews.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> BDB *loc. cit.*; GKC 52o. The BDB definition, however, is a conjectured reading.

<sup>85</sup> Howard, "Hebrews," 213.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Leonard, *Authorship*, 408; Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 336; Longenecker, *Biblical*, 169; Proctor, "Judgement," 76; Attridge, *Epistle*, 295; Bell, *Provoked*, 256-57; Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2006), 266.

<sup>87</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 352.

<sup>88</sup> Braun, *Hebräer*, 324; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 179; Lindars, *Apologetic*, 245. Weiss, *Brief*, 541 suggests that ἐμοὶ reflects the writer's viewpoint, but this seems unlikely in view of Hebrews' self-effacing disposition throughout the rest of the epistle.

<sup>89</sup> *Tg. Onq.* includes **סנל**, present in Heb and Rom, but absent in the LXX.

<sup>90</sup> A dependency mooted by Thomas, "Citations," 315. He suggests the borrowing aims to differentiate the interpretation of 32:35 from that of Philo (*Leg.* 3.105, following LXX), who appended ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως to 32:34 in order to negate the concept of an impending divine judgment.

<sup>91</sup> Although λέγει κύριος is found in some MSS of Heb 10:30 (**Σ**<sup>2</sup>A D<sup>2</sup> M b r), the phrase is likely an interpolation and assimilation to Rom 12:19 – so Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 542. The presence of τὸν εἰπόντα renders λέγει κύριος superfluous.

<sup>92</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.325.

<sup>93</sup> Kistemaker, *Psalms*, 46.

<sup>94</sup> Martin C. Albl, "And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (NovTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 168-69 suggests that the both authors



In terms of the quotation's application, a case may be made that Hebrews ignores the original context of Deut 32:35.<sup>95</sup> In the latter, the nations are traditionally cast as the object of the ἐκδίκησις (32:35), their judgment part of YHWH's vindication of his people Israel (32:36). Hebrews, on the other hand, makes the apostate believer the target of the ἐκδίκησις (Heb 10:26-29), and does not anticipate any divine vindication.<sup>96</sup> There is, however, good cause to ascribe continuity to this citational context: 10:27 describes the recipients of the judgment as ὑπεναντίους of God, potentially the same enemies (ἐχθροίς) avenged in 32:41,<sup>97</sup> whilst the promised ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας (Deut 32:35) is perhaps reflected in the ἀπώλεια fate of the timid in Heb 10:39. In both texts, the verses of judgment are subsequently followed by a more positive, encouraging exhortation (Deut 32:40; Heb 10:32-39).<sup>98</sup> More significantly, we argued in the previous chapter that the Song frequently blurs the distinction between Israel and the nations, and divine vengeance in 32:35 is not dispensed solely along ethnic lines.<sup>99</sup> Deuteronomy 32:35 functions as much as a warning *against* Israel, that they will be the recipients of the judgment should they pursue the course of idolatry and disobedience.<sup>100</sup> In retaining the Song's expectation of the punishment of YHWH's enemies, and, at the same time, defining such enemies as those who apostatise from him, Heb 10:30a offers a valid reading of Deut 32:35<sup>101</sup> and one perfectly conversant with the ethos of the Song as whole.<sup>102</sup> Just as

---

draw upon "a common Christian paraenetic EC (extract collection), analogous to that preserved in Cyprian Quirinius 3."

<sup>95</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 296 labels the application of both Deut 32 citations in Heb 10:30 "tendentious."

<sup>96</sup> See 3.1.3.

<sup>97</sup> The same verb (ἀνταποδώσω) is used in both 32:35 and 32:41.

<sup>98</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 543.

<sup>99</sup> See 2.2.3.

<sup>100</sup> As noted above, 32:35's final ὑμῖν (MT: לָמוֹ, i.e. 3<sup>rd</sup> person) specifically draws the audience into the judgment scope. *Tg. Onq.* perhaps also includes Israel in the warning of 32:35, reading the reference to feet slipping (הַמִּוֶּט רַגְלָם) as exit or banishment from the land.

<sup>101</sup> Philip E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 425 rightly asserts that Deut 32:35 pertains "both to the enemy from outside who refuses to acknowledge Yahweh's sway over him and to the enemy from within the community of the covenant who rebels against the God he previously had professed to honour." Justin's exploitation of Deut 32 with Trypho testifies to the Song's potential reading as a warning against Jewish over-confidence in their elect status. Cf. J. Rendel Harris, "A Factor of Old Testament Influence in the Old Testament," *ExpTim* 27 (1925-26): 6-11.

<sup>102</sup> So F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 265: "What was true then remains true for God's dealings with his people now."

Deut 32 posed the question about what it meant to be YHWH's chosen people, so Heb 10:26-31 sets forth a similar warning about obedience under the new covenant dispensation.

### **3.1.3 Heb 10:30b (Deut 32:36)**

<b>Deut 32:36 MT</b>	<b>Deut 32:36 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 10:30b</b>
כִּי יִדִּין יְהוָה עַמּוֹ	ὅτι κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ	κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ

In contrast to the textual complexities of Heb 10:30a, 10:30b's source is comparatively straightforward, it being an exact citation of the uniform tradition of Deut 32:36. The same text is found in Ps 134:14 LXX, but the fact that Deut 32:35 precedes the quotation in Heb 10:30a makes Deut 32:36 the more likely source.<sup>103</sup> Psalm 134 probably postdates the Deuteronomic version;<sup>104</sup> it displays strong Deuteronomic overtones (recounting what YHWH had done for them (134:8-11), the land gift (134:12), the emphasis on the prohibition of idols (134:15-18)), and 134:14 is best seen as an exemplar of Deut 32:36 's usage, rather than the source of the quotation in Heb 10:30b.

Whereas the text of the citation is consistent with its LXX provenance, scholars generally observe that Hebrews' usage departs radically from its function within Deuteronomy.<sup>105</sup> According to the previously discussed 'positive' view of 32:35-36,<sup>106</sup> YHWH exacts vengeance upon his enemies (32:35) because he vows to vindicate (κρινεῖ) his people (32:36a) and have compassion upon his servants

<sup>103</sup> Hebrews 2:13 similarly cites two neighbouring verses (Isa 8:17-18). Hebrews does, however, juxtapose Psalm & Torah quotation elsewhere (cf. 13:5-6).

<sup>104</sup> Sanders, *Provenance*, 412.

<sup>105</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 453; Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews* (London: United Bible Societies, 1983), 239. Cf. also Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy*, 172: "By the standard of the New Testament as a whole, this writer's thought is limited in (1) not laying sufficient emphasis on the persistence of divine grace and (2) not emphasizing the retribution of God is intended to be an instrument of his saving mercy."

<sup>106</sup> See 2.2.3.

(32:36b). Hebrews, however, removes the causal ὅτι (32:36)<sup>107</sup> and consequently reinterprets κρίνῃ (10:30b); 10:30b becomes, not the cause of 10:30a, but rather its emphatic re-enforcement.<sup>108</sup> God will *judge* his people, not *vindicate* them; the apparent assurance of Deut 32:36 becomes the warning of Heb 10:30b.

Some scholars remain unperturbed by such apparent misquotation. Calvin ventures, for example, that "there is no reason why the Apostle should not have accommodated to a different purpose what was set forth by Moses for the consolation of the godly, in order that believers might be the more heedful, the nearer they saw God to show Himself as the Judge of His Church."<sup>109</sup> Others, however, seek to rehabilitate Hebrews and justify its application of the cited text as contextually faithful. The judgment, for example, is one of mercy; in the process of the destruction of YHWH's enemies, God's people are removed from its purview.<sup>110</sup> Alternatively, it has been suggested that κρίνω (10:30b) be rendered as 'vindicate', commensurate with the 'positive' context ascribed to Deut 32:36.<sup>111</sup> Both explanations, however, neglect the overall context of 10:26-31 and the synonymy implied by καὶ πάλιν; the vengeance upon YHWH's enemies is equated with the judgment of his people. In such judgment, the λαὸν αὐτοῦ face the terrifying prospect of falling (ἐμπίπτω) into the hands of the living God (10:31). Πίπτω forms elsewhere in the letter generally carry negative/apostate connotations (3:17, 4:11, 6:6) and it is therefore highly probable that 10:30b levies a daunting warning against those apostate members of Hebrews' audience. Mercy and/or vindication are not on 10:30b's horizon.

Yet this need not mean that Hebrews has eschewed the prevailing context of Deut 32:36 and the Song's broader Deuteronomic milieu. The surrounding verses retain the Deuteronomic flavour of the pericope; the dread of the living God (10:31;

---

<sup>107</sup> The inclusion of ὅτι in several MSS of 10:30 (D 81 104 629) increases the likelihood of Deut 32:36 being the cited text.

<sup>108</sup> Splitting the two quotations accentuates the second one – so Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 239.

<sup>109</sup> John Calvin, *Harmony of the Pentateuch* (trans. Charles William Bingham; 4 vols.; vol. 4; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1855), 365.

<sup>110</sup> Leonard, *Authorship*, 347 understands 10:30b as "a judgement of mercy in favour of God's people."

<sup>111</sup> Proctor, "Judgement," 65-80; James Swetnam, "Suggested Interpretation of Hebrews 9:15-18," *CBQ* 27 (1965): 382n30, developed later in James Swetnam, "Hebrews 10:30-31: A Suggestion," *Bib* 75 (1994): 388-94. Κρίνω is rendered 'judge', not 'vindicate', elsewhere in the letter – Heb 13:4.

cf. Deut 5:36) who controls life and death (cf. Deut 32:39), the image of fiery judgment (10:27; cf. Deut 4:24, 4:33, 5:26, Heb 12:29), and the Deuteronomic warning regarding a plurality of witnesses (10:28) all ground the warnings of 10:30 solidly in the Deuteronomy text. We have also observed above that Deut 32:36 may be read with antithetical, rather than synonymous, parallelism,<sup>112</sup> with κρινεῖ (32:36a) understood as punitive judgment and not divine vindication. Taking seriously the ambiguity of Deut 32:35-36,<sup>113</sup> Hebrews understands these verses as warning Israel against rejecting the divine covenant and (re-)applies them in similar terms vis-à-vis new covenant obedience.<sup>114</sup> It plays off the election/judgment dichotomy elucidated within the Song, and, as with Deut 32:35-36, implicitly addresses the question as to who are λαὸν αὐτοῦ, the people of God. It defines them as those who embrace the new covenant inaugurated by Christ; any who appeal to ethnic or, more specifically, cultic/liturgical qualification have no grounds for membership.

### **3.1.4 Heb 12:21 (Deut 9:19)**

Moses' words of 12:21 qualify as a quotation in terms of the prior IF (Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν),<sup>115</sup> but, being merely reported speech, rather than an exhortation or warning levied at the audience, the citation lacks the hermeneutical significance normally attached to Hebrews' other Deuteronomic quotations.<sup>116</sup> Its provenance and context are also disputed; it possesses no absolute Pentateuchal equivalent<sup>117</sup> and the OT

---

<sup>112</sup> So Randall C. Gleason, "The Eschatology of the Warning in Hebrews 10:26-31," *TynBul* 53 (2002): 118n71.

<sup>113</sup> See 2.2.3.

<sup>114</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 265 seems to adopt a similar position, although without specifically alluding to the Song's ambiguities: "he will execute judgement on their behalf, vindicating their cause against their enemies, but ... on the same principles of impartial righteousness, he will execute judgment against them when they forsake his covenant."

<sup>115</sup> It is cited as a quotation by UBS<sup>4</sup>; Guthrie, "Old," 849; Thomas, "Citations," 317-18; Longenecker, *Biblical*, 166; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.331. It is omitted by Karrer, "Epistle," 337-38. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 471 calls it an allusion to Deut 9:19, so also Attridge, *Epistle*, 374; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 330.

<sup>116</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 220 is sceptical of 12:21's inclusion among the Deuteronomic quotations. Although there are clearly similarities with Deut 9:19, "(w)e cannot even say with confidence that these parallels have guided the author in his choice of words."

<sup>117</sup> The only LXX incidence of the dual occurrence of the adjectives is 1 Macc 13:2, in a non-Sinai context.

depiction of Moses does not characterise him as especially fearful when approaching the mountain. Hebrews 12:21 probably owes something to haggadic development, particularly the application of both ἔκφοβός and ἔντρομος to Moses;<sup>118</sup> the closest text is perhaps *b. Shabbat 88b*<sup>119</sup> in which Moses declares before YHWH on the mountain: “Lord of the world, I’m afraid lest they (i.e. the angels) burn me with the breath of their mouths.”<sup>120</sup> First Enoch 89:30 is also mentioned in this context,<sup>121</sup> but this text only describes the universal fear of the sheep before their Lord; it does not ascribe particular fear to “that sheep,” the representative figure of Moses.

Assuming some haggadic expansion, however, it is probable that a particular text occasioned or contributed to that development and perhaps provided the actual phrasing for the quotation in 12:21. Three potential sources for 12:21 are feasible, the first and third of which are compatible with some form of later haggadic development.<sup>122</sup>

#### **3.1.4.1 Heb 12:21 & Exod 3:1-6/Acts 7:32**

<b>Acts 7:32</b>	<b>Heb 12:21</b>
ἔντρομος δὲ γενόμενος Μωϋσῆς οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσα	Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος

Exodus 3:1-6 locates Moses at Horeb (Sinai) and describes him as fearful (3:6) before YHWH in the burning bush (καίεται πυρί, Exod 3:2: cf. Heb 12:18). The episode specifically articulates a fear of the *vision* of God (τὸ ὄραμα τὸ μέγα τοῦτο, Exod 3:3), akin to Hebrews' designation (τὸ φανταζόμενον, Heb 12:21), and

<sup>118</sup> Most commentators conclude this: cf. Attridge, *Epistle*, 374; Hughes, *Commentary*, 543; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 355; Thomas Hewitt, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; London: 1960), 200. Wilson, *Hebrews*, 229-30 suggests that Hebrews is citing from memory and thus confused in his recollection.

<sup>119</sup> Michel, *Brief*, 462.

<sup>120</sup> Translation of Jacob Neusner, *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation. Vol.2, Tractate Shabbat* (BJS 270; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

<sup>121</sup> Windisch, *Hebräerbrief*, 103; Kistemaker, *Psalms*, 53n2.

<sup>122</sup> See Lane, *Hebrews*, 463-64 for a comprehensive review of the issues.

is possibly alluded to again in Heb 11:27. As Acts 7:32 describes Moses at the bush as ἑντρομος γενόμενος, some commentators have understood the episode to form the backdrop for Heb 12:21.<sup>123</sup> Such an explanation, however, remains difficult. Hebrews presents the text as a quotation, and Exod 3:1-6 itself offers no words actually replicated in 12:21. The narrative distance between the burning bush (Exod 3) and the assembly of Israel at Sinai (Exod 19:1-20:21) is also excessive and any putative reference in 12:18-21 would go beyond that pericope's emphasis on the covenant-making moment. The burning bush remains a pre- rather than post-exodus event.

#### **3.1.4.2 Heb 12:21 as Christian exegesis**

The attribution of fear to Moses may be a Christian development, possibly a contribution of Hebrews' itself.<sup>124</sup> Moses' fear is consistent with the pericope's terrifying portrayal of Sinai and, in the absence of a prior LXX text, some authorial influence is certainly conceivable. As Pamela Eisenbaum has shown in relation to Heb 11, Christian re-telling of the Jewish story is prominent elsewhere in the letter,<sup>125</sup> and 12:21 may reflect further 'Christianising' of the Jewish narrative. Yet even in such reworking, Hebrews remains generally faithful to his source text, and is unlikely to depart so significantly from the material without good reason. Marks of Christian/Hebrews influence in 12:21 are possible, but, without further evidence, not a compelling option.

#### **3.1.4.3 Heb 12:21 & Deut 9:19**

<b>Deut 9:19</b>	<b>Heb 12:21</b>
καὶ ἔκφοβός εἰμι διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν	Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ

<sup>123</sup> Hughes, *Commentary*, 543.

<sup>124</sup> Marie E. Isaacs, *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (JSNTSup 73; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 124-25.

<sup>125</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 189-227.

Deuteronomy 9:19 remains the most favoured suggestion of commentators,<sup>126</sup> even if many criticize Hebrews for erroneously extracting it from the golden calf incident.<sup>127</sup> Moses fears YHWH's wrathful response to Israel's sinful idolatry (9:15-21), rather than the Horeb vision of God attested in Deut 4:11-12. Yet Deut 9:19 still accords ἔκφοβός εἰμι to Moses, a not insignificant inclusion in view of the rarity of ἔκφοβός (elsewhere only Mark 9:6; 1 Macc 13:2) and the similarly unusual present tense form of εἰμι.<sup>128</sup> The context also derives broadly from Israel's experience at Sinai; the mountain still burns with fire (Deut 9:15), and the symbolic breaking of the tablets (Deut 9:17) resonates thematically with the demise of the Sinai covenant.<sup>129</sup> If Heb 12:21 does reflect a Scriptural quotation, Deut 9:19 remains the most likely candidate.

Comparison with the whole letter supports this contention.<sup>130</sup> Hebrews 12:18-24 compares the concept of judgment within two respective dispensations,<sup>131</sup> portraying Sinai in 12:18-21 as imposing, foreboding and intimidating. The holiness of God is inaccessible (12:20), with imminent death awaiting anyone who dares approach YHWH (12:20). Divine judgment is discussed earlier in the letter, especially 10:26-31, and the parallels between this passage and 12:18-29 are acute.<sup>132</sup> Hebrews 10:26-27 is of particular interest for its elucidation of a judgment contingent upon anyone

<sup>126</sup> Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 52-53; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.331; Longenecker, *Biblical*, 166; Guthrie, "Old," 849; UBS<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>127</sup> Moffatt, *Commentary*, 216; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.404-05; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 466.

<sup>128</sup> One would normally anticipate a past/aorist tense rendering גָּרַח, particularly in view of Deut 9:19's narrative context – so Wevers, *Notes*, 167.

<sup>129</sup> Venema, *Reading*, 3-46 argues that Deut 9-10 is primarily concerned with the fate of the tablets and not the actual golden calf incident.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Leonard, *Authorship*, 243-44.

<sup>131</sup> Franz Laub, *Bekenntnis und Auslegung: Die Paränetische Funktion der Christologie im Hebräerbrieff* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1980), 253: "das verbindende Element des ganzen Abschnitts der Gerichtsgedanke ist"; he premises this conclusion on the usage of Exod 19:12-18 and Deut 9:19.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. the dominant φοβέρος language of 10:27, 31 and 12:21, the motif of judgment (10:27, 30-31; 12:20, 23), the theophanic manifestation of fire (10:27; 12:18) and the notion of God as the one who controls life (10:31; 12:20-21).

who sins (ἁμαρτάνω) after receiving the word of truth. Such a scenario parallels the golden calf incident, from which Deut 9:19 is derived; having received the word of God (Deut 9:10; cf. Heb 10:26), Israel carried on sinning (Deut 9:16, 18; cf. Heb 10:26) and built a 'sinful thing' (Deut 9:21). The golden calf is depicted as paradigmatic of Israel's sinfulness, McConville opining that 9:22-24 "suit(s) the tendency of Deuteronomy's version of the golden-calf narrative to make it typical of Israel's character rather than a singularly important event."<sup>133</sup> In the face of such archetypal sin, Moses feared YHWH's anger, the anger that would have brought about Israel's judgment and destruction (Deut 9:19; cf. Heb 10:27, 31). Moses' forty-day fasting, occasioned by Israel's sinfulness and their provoking YHWH to anger (Deut 9:18), may have rhetorical affinity with Israel's forty year's rebellion and YHWH's forty-year wrath as articulated earlier in the epistle (Heb 3:10, 3:17).

Whilst it is the sight of God that induced Moses' fear (12:21), and not his anger *per se*, the distinction is only relative, for the sight demonstrated YHWH's awe-inspiring holiness that would both judge sin and occasion Moses' terror. We suggest that the citation of Deut 9:19 in 12:21 implicitly evokes the paradigmatic golden calf incident (along with the symbolic breaking of the covenant tablets), intensifies its relationship with 10:26-31, and evokes Sinai's full implications for Israel. Casey makes this connection and ventures that "the general judgment tone of the section, as well as the deliberate stress upon the guilt of the Israelites, could possibly have led the author to combine the two accounts in this case."<sup>134</sup> Even in the light of the defining covenant-giving moment, Sinai failed to deal with the root problem of sin, the very problem to which Hebrews has addressed itself throughout the letter (7:27; 9:15; 9:28; 10:3-4).<sup>135</sup> By giving the Sinai narrative its full parameters and recalling the entire old covenant dispensation (not just the promulgation of the law),<sup>136</sup> Hebrews demonstrates Sinai's inherent inability to deal with sin in the face of divine

---

<sup>133</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 185.

<sup>134</sup> Casey, "Eschatology", 329.

<sup>135</sup> Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 273-411 makes a similar argument for Paul's reading of the Sinai narrative.

<sup>136</sup> In respect to Hebrews' understanding of the symbolism of Sinai, Casey, "Eschatology", 307 notes: "To recall Sinai is to recall all of the old covenant."



judgment.<sup>137</sup> The audience must embrace the dispensation that has dealt with sin, rather than revert to the old covenant epoch that ultimately only bred death.

### **3.1.5 Heb 12:29 (Deut 4:24/9:3)**

Although it is not universally listed as such,<sup>138</sup> we have tentatively labelled the OT citation in Heb 12:29 a quotation on grounds of lexical similarity and the IF function of καὶ γὰρ. Although some may dispute this categorisation, the contribution of the citation as a rhetorical flourish to the Sinai-Zion discourse of 12:18-29 remains nonetheless significant.

<b>Deut 4:24 LXX</b>	<b>Deut 9:3 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 12:29</b>
ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν	ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου οὗτος προπορεύεται πρὸ προσώπου σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν	καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον

Either Deut 4:24 or 9:3 might be viewed as the *Vorlage* of Heb 12:29, since πῦρ καταναλίσκον is found in the LXX only in these two verses.<sup>139</sup> Neither text

<sup>137</sup> Patrick Gray, *Godly Fear: The Epistle to the Hebrews and Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition* (SBLABib 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 206-07 contends that 12:21 incorporates the 'fearfulness' of Deut 4:1-40, and his suggestion seems plausible. The golden calf incident could have benefited Moses, making him a great nation (Deut 9:11-14); Deut 4:21-22, however, stresses his absence from the land, a personally fearful prospect, but one still occasioned by Israel's disobedience/sin.

<sup>138</sup> It is labelled a quotation by Thomas Kem Oberholtzer, "The Warning Passages in Hebrews, Pt 5: The Failure to Heed His Speaking in Hebrews 12:25-29," *BSac* 146 (1989): 74; Gordon, *Hebrews*, 161; Alexander Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913), 417. It is variously described elsewhere as a "virtual citation" (Leonard, *Authorship*, 247), "adaptation" (Attridge, *Epistle*, 383), "echo" (Wilson, *Hebrews*, 235), "allusion" (Lane, *Hebrews*, 487), "recontextualization" (deSilva, *Perseverance*, 477) and "epigram" (France, "Writer," 258). Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.331 lists it in his collection of OT quotations; Katz, "Quotations," excludes it from his compilation of Deuteronomic quotations, as do the Kistemaker, *Psalms*, 17-57; UBS<sup>4</sup>. Guthrie, "Old," omits the citation entirely.

<sup>139</sup> Exodus 24:17 offers a close parallel (πῦρ φλέγον) – Attridge, *Epistle*, 383n82; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 208. The Hebrew is equivalent in all three instances: Exod 24:17, אֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת; Deut 4:24, 9:3, אֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת. Cf. also Isa 29:6: πυρὸς κατεσθίουσα.

matches perfectly, as 12:29 replaces the Deuteronomic σου with ἡμῶν,<sup>140</sup> perhaps to mollify a weighty warning by personally identifying with the audience's situation (cf. Heb 12:25). Deuteronomy 4:24, however, is the more probable source; its length and word order are closer to Heb 12:29 than the more expansive 9:3, and its use of the πῦρ καταναλίσκον motif is more attuned to that of Hebrews. Where 9:3 anticipates the punishment of the Anakites, Deut 4:21-24 specifically articulates Israel's judgment should they pursue idolatry. Whilst Hebrews would probably not dissent from universalizing YHWH's judgment, the primary focus of 12:29 is internal, upon those who disregard the divine gift.<sup>141</sup>

The quotation is also contextually appropriate. Hebrews' concern is reverent worship (λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ, 12:28), whilst Deut 4:23-24 warns against idolatry and covenantal abuse.<sup>142</sup> Deuteronomy 4:24 subsequently describes YHWH as a θεὸς ζηλωτής,<sup>143</sup> consistent with the divine portrayal of Heb 10:27 (πυρὸς ζηλος).<sup>144</sup> Beyond v24, Deut 4:36 previews the 'dualistic' warnings of Heb 12:25-27; the fire is the warning on the earth, the voice the one from heaven.

Once more then, as in 10:30, Hebrews re-uses an old covenant exhortation to ground the warnings related to the new covenant, preserving the former

---

<sup>140</sup> Although absent from 4:24, θεὸς ἡμῶν is far from alien to Deuteronomy, the phrase occurring more regularly only in the Psalms – so Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 691. Its absence in 4:24 perhaps reflects Moses' perspective on events across the Jordan, events to which he will not be party (4:22-23).

<sup>141</sup> Hebrews associates fire with judgment elsewhere (6:8, 10:27) and seemingly so here in 12:29. Taken within the Deuteronomic context, 12:29 offers no suggestion of a refining or purifying fire (contra Robert Jewett, *Letters to Pilgrims: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (New York: Pilgrim, 1981), 228), but rather a punitive one for the apostate, as in 10:26-31 (so Moffatt, *Commentary*, 223). David Wider, *Theozentrik und Bekenntnis: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Redens Gottes im Hebräerbrief* (BZNW 87; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 97-100 finds the judgment context for 12:29 difficult to resolve, preferring to view it as a statement of divine holiness (i.e. preserving the continuity with the portrayal of 12:18-21). The judgment parallels with 10:26-31, however, are difficult to ignore and the distinction between God's holiness and his judicial role is perhaps one that Hebrews does not draw.

<sup>142</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 80 describes the prohibitions of Deut 4:23-24 as testifying to an "imageless" cult. Hebrews perhaps reverses this trend by proclaiming the Son as the χαρακτήρ that may be worshipped (1:3); although appealing to Gnostic imagery, it is notable that Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 61-71 describes the Son as the divine εἰκὼν.

<sup>143</sup> On 4:24, Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 208 notes how the divine fire "flares after being moved to jealousy." Tg. Neof. on both Deut 4:24 and 9:3 adds "an avenger in jealousy" to compound the relationship between the purity of worship and judgment.

<sup>144</sup> The link with 10:27 is compounded in that ἐσθίω (10:27) and καταναλίσκω (12:29; Deut 4:24) seem somewhat interchangeable. The synonymy is even closer in Aquila, who renders אכל (4:24) with κατεσθίον – Wevers, *Notes*, 80.

dispensation's Sinai milieu and stressing the continuity between the respective orders.<sup>145</sup> The 'fearful' awesomeness of Sinai is only increased (πολὺ μᾶλλον, 12:25); there is no attempt to water down the concept as in Philo (*Decal.* 49).<sup>146</sup> The god who revealed himself on Sinai as the consuming fire still requires worship that it is 'fear-ful' (δέος, 12:28).<sup>147</sup> Without wishing to separate Heb 13 from the rest of the letter, there is a sense in which 12:18-29 climaxes the letter thus far, with 12:29 providing a critical, rhetorical flourish.<sup>148</sup> Hebrews' argument therefore culminates in a Deuteronomic warning, one that echoes the Deuteronomic pre-conquest posture; theologically and rhetorically, it locates the audience – the new Israel – at the climax of their pilgrimage, at the threshold of entry in to the land (cf. 1:6).<sup>149</sup>

### **3.1.6 Heb 13:5 (Deut 31:6)**

Alongside Heb 1:6, the source of the citation in Heb 13:5 is contested perhaps more than any other quotation in Hebrews. No Septuagint text matches the cited form and Deut 31:6,<sup>150</sup> Deut 31:8,<sup>151</sup> Gen 28:17<sup>152</sup> and Josh 1:5,<sup>153</sup> along with various

---

<sup>145</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 487: "It was appropriate in this context to recall the Sinai revelation, since God's holy character remains unaltered under the new covenant." Michel, *Brief*, 478 suggests that, rather than merely make a statement about continuity, Hebrews uses an OT quotation to draw the audience back to the Sinai moment and its inherent seriousness. Wider, *Theozentrik*, 97-100 argues that the consuming fire demonstrates the "Selbigkeit" of each event – the holiness of God is the same in both dispensations.

<sup>146</sup> Deuteronomy 4:24 is not itself directly cited, but the divine fire imagery is described as bringing both illumination and judgment.

<sup>147</sup> Δέος in the LXX implies fear/terror (2 Macc 3:17, 3:30, 12:22, 13:16, 15:23).

<sup>148</sup> Koester's proposal that 12:28 marks a new pericope and peroration (12:28-13:9) is unpersuasive (Craig R. Koester, "Hebrew, Rhetoric, and the Future of Humanity," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 120-21). The serious portent of 12:29 fits far better with the warning of 12:25-27 than the more ethical exhortations of 13:1-9.

<sup>149</sup> The quotation also underscores the continuity of God's revelation in both covenants (as in Heb 1:1) – so Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.414. There is a pleasant circularity to 1:1 and 12:29, whereby both 'bookending' verses appeal to the continuity of divine revelation.

<sup>150</sup> UBS<sup>4</sup>; Wevers, *Notes*, 494; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 239; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.335; Michel, *Brief*, 483; Kistemaker, *Psalms*, 54-56; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 232; Koester, *Hebrews*, 559; Marie E. Isaacs, *Reading Hebrews and James: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 155; Gheorgita, *Role*, 70. Karrer, "Epistle," 347-48 proposes that it is a form "collateral" to, but distinct from, the OG of Deut 31:6.

<sup>151</sup> Williamson, *Philo*, 570-73, composite with Josh 1:5 or Gen 28:15.

<sup>152</sup> BDF§431. Peter Katz, "Hebrews 13:5: The Biblical Source of the Quotation," *Bib* 33 S (1952): 523-25, though extended by Deut 31:6.

<sup>153</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 368; Sowers, *Hermeneutics*, 66; Hughes, *Commentary*, 568; Calvin, *Epistle*, 206.

combinations of the respective texts, have all been hitherto suggested as the source of the citation. In the absence of an obvious *Vorlage*, some commentators have preferred to remain agnostic as to the text's origin.<sup>154</sup>

	<b>Heb 13:5</b>
	οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω
<b>Gen 28:15 MT</b>	<b>Gen 28:15 LXX</b>
לֹא אֶעֱזָבְךָ	οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω
<b>Deut 31:6 MT</b>	<b>Deut 31:6 LXX</b>
לֹא יִרְפָּךְ וְלֹא יִעֲזָבְךָ	οὐ μή σε ἀνή οὔτε μή σε ἐγκαταλίπη
<b>Deut 31:8 MT</b>	<b>Deut 31:8 LXX</b>
לֹא יִרְפָּךְ וְלֹא יִעֲזָבְךָ	οὐκ ἀνήσει σε οὐδὲ μή ἐγκαταλίπη σε
<b>Josh 1:5 MT</b>	<b>Josh 1:5 LXX</b>
לֹא אֶרְפָּךְ וְלֹא אֶעֱזָבְךָ	οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδὲ ὑπερόψομαί σε

In terms of lexical affinity, Josh 1:5 MT is identical to Heb 13:5, although its LXX equivalent differs strongly from the cited figure. Purely on lexical grounds, therefore, Heb 13:5 is a quotation of Josh 1:5, exhibiting either an unattested variant Greek form of Josh 1:5, or possibly the use of a Hebrew *Vorlage*.

A case for a Deuteronomic citation, however, is equally plausible. Deuteronomy renders the logion twice in close proximity (31:6, 31:8) and, of the mooted Greek texts, 31:6 is the closest to Heb 13:5. The only difference is the use of the 3<sup>rd</sup>, rather than 1<sup>st</sup>, person.<sup>155</sup> As Hebrews frequently attributes Scriptural quotations to literal divine speech (1:5-6, 2:12-13, 3:7, 4:3, 10:5-7, 10:16-17), adopting a variant lemma with YHWH as speaker would be entirely characteristic; coupled with the emphatic αὐτὸς, the use of the 1<sup>st</sup> person adds extra significance to

<sup>154</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 519-20; Héring, *L'Épître*, 122.

<sup>155</sup> MS f(53) of Deuteronomy renders the first-person form, perhaps induced by Hebrews – Attridge, *Epistle*, 389n72.

an already weighty promise.<sup>156</sup> Deuteronomy 31:6 also preserves the subjunctive mood in both verbal forms (unlike Deut 31:8) and, in contrast to Josh 1:5 LXX, retains the same two verbs as 13:5.

There are also substantial contextual reasons for finding the origin of Heb 13:5 in Deut 31:6. Of the various options, it is the only instance in which the promise is made corporately to an assembled community,<sup>157</sup> a context shared by Heb 13:5, and one perhaps emphasized by the same verb (ἐγκαταλείπω) being used negatively of those who are leaving the community (10:25). More broadly, the subsequent use of θαρρέω and οὐ φοβηθήσομαι (13:6) echo the exhortation to courage and fearlessness in Deut 31:6 (ἀνδρίζου καὶ ἴσχυε μὴ φοβου);<sup>158</sup> in both texts, the divine promise is the essential grounds for confidence in the future (Josh 1:5 makes the same connection). The shift in 13:7 to the recognition of leaders also provides an interesting parallel to the Moses/Joshua leadership exchange in Deut 31:7-8. However, as much of this contextual similarity could also be observed regarding Josh 1, a certain degree of caution is requisite. Perhaps Heb 13:5 is best understood as citing a text tradition broadly derived from the Moses/Joshua handover, one that lacks formal modern attestation, but which articulates the textual format found in both Deut 31:6/8 LXX and Josh 1:5 MT.

As the quotation is found in the same form in Philo (*Conf.* 166), Hebrews itself has not created a variant tradition,<sup>159</sup> but equally, the minimal thematic correlation between their respective uses of the citation undermines any suggestion that Hebrews was dependent upon Philo for the textual form.<sup>160</sup> It is conceivable that both authors shared a common Alexandrian source,<sup>161</sup> but, more likely, the logion was a familiar synagogue rendering, perhaps derived from a liturgical setting.<sup>162</sup> As

---

<sup>156</sup> Οὐ μὴ with the subjunctive is the "most definite form of negation regarding the future" (BDF§365). The completed sense of the perfect εἴρηκεν may also increase the surety of the promise.

<sup>157</sup> Although the object of 13:5 is singular (σε), its broader context (13:1-6) requires a communal referent.

<sup>158</sup> Gheorgita, *Role*, 70.

<sup>159</sup> Hebrews and Philo twice share readings unattested in the LXX (4:4, 13:5) – Sowers, *Hermeneutics*, 66.

<sup>160</sup> Contra Moffatt, *Commentary*, 229.

<sup>161</sup> So Williamson, *Philo*, 571.

<sup>162</sup> Kistemaker, *Psalms*, 56, citing Delitzsch, who views the quotation as a liturgical variant of Deut 31:6.

such, even though conflation is found elsewhere in Hebrews (10:37, 12:18-19), there seems no compulsion to follow Katz and see Heb 13:5 as an expansion of Gen 28:17, conformed to Deut 31:6, 8.<sup>163</sup>

Katz's suggestion, however, that the logion is always used in association with Jacob, underlines the strong connection between the phrase and the notion of covenantal exchange. In all the texts cited above (and additionally 1 Chron 28:20), the context of the phrase is covenantal responsibility or fulfilment; in Deuteronomy itself, of the eight uses of ἐγκαταλείπω, two are explicitly covenantal in context (4:31, 31:6), five implicitly so (28:20, 31:6, 31:8, 32:15, 32:18). This is germane to its usage in Heb 13:5. Whilst its immediate context is an exhortation against ἀφιλόργυρος, it is difficult to escape the verse's implication of divine presence in the midst of the audience's broader struggles with holding fast to their (new) covenantal confession (10:32-39). Although the volume of 13:5's potential *sources* is problematic, one can speculate on its *use* with far more confidence. More than merely a convenient proof text, 13:5b encourages new covenant faithfulness in the same guise as the old, replaying a motif steeped in Israel's history and particularly the land threshold moment.<sup>164</sup> It demonstrates how "the position of Jewish Christians corresponded spiritually with that of their fathers on the verge of Canaan."<sup>165</sup>

### **3.2 Deuteronomic Strong Allusions in Hebrews**

Having examined the function of the Deuteronomic quotations in Hebrews, we now turn to two other citational categories ('strong allusion and 'echo'). The first grouping comprises those allusions that possess significant lexical and thematic correspondence to the original source and are generally acknowledged within the commentaries. As with the quotations, the focus of our examination is twofold: to

---

<sup>163</sup> Katz, "Hebrews 13:5," 523-25.

<sup>164</sup> In the two instances in which Hebrews directly addresses his audience with a biblical quotation (Ps 95:7-11, Deut 31:6; Prov 3:11-12 is applied to the audience 'as sons,' but its original form is not imperative), the addressees of the original source are implicitly the forefathers in the wilderness. With such direct application, Hebrews equates his contemporary audience with the situation of wilderness Israel, an association we will revisit in 5.3. If we understand Ps 95 as a Deuteronomic psalm (so Hossfeld et al., *Psalms* 2, 461), then, in both instances, the audience of Hebrews rhetorically becomes the Israel of Deuteronomy.

<sup>165</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 433.

identity the genuineness of the allusion and then to assess its significance for and contribution to Hebrews' paraenetic enterprise.

### 3.2.1 Deut 32:15/Heb 3:12<sup>166</sup>

Deut 32:15b LXX	Heb 3:12
καὶ ἐγκατέλιπεν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέστη ἀπὸ θεοῦ σωτήρος αὐτοῦ	Βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μήποτε ἔσται ἕν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος

The logion ἀφίστημι ἀπὸ θεοῦ appears only once in the LXX and is the primary lexical tie that binds together Deut 32:15 and Heb 3:12.<sup>167</sup> The inflected form of the phrase differs between the respective verses, but this reflects variant authorial perspectives; Deut 32:15b recounts a specific act of apostasy, whereas Hebrews' warns against a possible, though as yet unrealised, occurrence.

Beyond the shared lemma, some contextual similarity may also be found. Deuteronomy 32:15-21 shares common material with Ps 95, which has just been cited by Hebrews (3:7-11).<sup>168</sup> The notion of God as creator (Ps 95:6: cf. Deut 32:15, 32:18) is notably prominent, as is the concept of bitterness (Ps 95:8, cf. 32:16, possibly also 32:19).<sup>169</sup> The use of ἀπάτη (Heb 3:13), customarily rendered as 'deceitfulness' (NIV, NASB, NRSV, KJV) can also convey connotations of sinful

<sup>166</sup> To my knowledge, this strong allusion has not yet been noted within the standard commentaries.

<sup>167</sup> Gheorgita, *Role*, 108-11 advocates Num 14:9 as a potential referent for 3:12, and this should not be dismissed lightly in view of the subsequent allusions to events of Num 14 in 3:7-19. In its favour, Num 14:9 shares Heb 3:12's negative hortatory context, but it lacks the shared ἀφίστημι ἀπὸ θεοῦ lemma. The verb ἀφίστημι is present, but in a non-apostate context and applied to the Canaanites; instead, Israel are urged not to become ἀποστάται, a nominal form for which even Gheorgita admits "the cognate verb ἀφίστημι offers no help in deciding the meaning" (109). Such ambiguity must thus caution against overstating any alleged Num 14:9 allusion; whilst Num 14 undoubtedly contributes to the narrative symbolism of Heb 3:12-19, the theological and lexical contributions of Deut 32:15 are superior options for exegeting 3:12.

<sup>168</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 452.

<sup>169</sup> Ἐκπικραίνω (32:16) is an LXX *hapax legomenon*, with παραπικραίνω the more customary form (cf. Heb 3:16; also παραπικρασμός – Ps 94:8 LXX, Heb 3:8). Leschert, *Hermeneutical*, 130 notes that παροξύνω (32:16, 32:19) and παραπικραίνω (Deut 31:27) are strongly related (cf. Ps 77:40-41 LXX); one might also include παροργίζω (Deut 32:19, Ps 77:40) in that grouping.

pleasure,<sup>170</sup> the mindset echoed in Deut 32:14-15, where Israel abuses YHWH's blessing and provision and consequently becomes fat and useless. With ἀπάτη taken in this sense, the audience of Hebrews is warned against distractions that might lead them into apostasy and failure to enter into the divine rest.

Within the Song's broader structure, Deut 32:15 marks the point at which Israel's apostasy is outlined, and where the narrative moves from blessing to rebellion. Deuteronomy 32:15-21 revisits the contrast outlined in the Song's theme verses (32:4-6), between YHWH's covenantal faithfulness (32:4) and Israel's corresponding faithlessness (32:5-6). It is in this broader context that the inter-relationship between Deut 32:15-25 and Heb 3:7-19 (and, by extension, 3:1-6) becomes even more acute. Deuteronomy 32:20 (γενεὰ ἐξεστραμμένη) replays the imagery of 32:5 (γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη),<sup>171</sup> with Israel's action explicitly labelled as sin (ἡμάρτοσαν), the same accusation Hebrews levels against the wilderness generation (3:13, 3:17).<sup>172</sup> Whereas all YHWH's ways are just and all his works righteous (32:4), Israel has seen those works, rebelled (32:5; cf. Heb 3:9) and rejected his ways (32:6; cf. Heb 3:10). Israel have failed to be sons (32:5, 32:20),<sup>173</sup> forgotten their Father (32:6) and abandoned their creator (32:15). The beloved language of 32:15 echoes the 'son' status to which Israel has failed to live up; where YHWH has been faithful (θεὸς πιστός, 32:4), they have been unfaithful sons (οὐκ ἔστιν πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς, 32:20).<sup>174</sup>

This play on contrasting paternal/filial πίστις resonates with the context of Heb 3:1-6/7-19. Christ is lauded as the paradigm faithful Son (3:6), and wilderness Israel (as son; cf. 1:6, 12:7) embodies the faithless firstborn whose ἀπιστία denies

---

<sup>170</sup> BDAG on ἀπάτη classifies 3:13 under 'deception/deceitfulness' but concedes that "sense 2 (i.e. pleasure derived from sin) is also probable for the synoptic passages and Hb 3:13."

<sup>171</sup> Sanders, *Provenance*, 189.

<sup>172</sup> C. Marvin Pate, *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel* (Leicester: Apollos, 2000), 206 sees Heb 3:7-19 as expounding Deut 32:5 (γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη), a likely possibility in view of the other links we are identifying between Heb 3:1-19 and Deut 32:4-21.

<sup>173</sup> LXX – τέκνα, but MT – בָּנָיִם. The LXX still utilises the sonship motif: 32:20, re-presenting 32:5, uses υἱοί.

<sup>174</sup> The πίστις motif reoccurs in 32:37 with Israel (and perhaps the nations, by extension) accused of trusting (περίθω) other gods.



them their land inheritance (3:16-19).<sup>175</sup> The sentence structure compounds the association; where Heb 3:12 reads 'ἐν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας', Deut 32:20 renders 'ἐστὶν υἱοὶ οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν πίστις ἐν αὐτοῖς.' The Deut 32:15/Heb 3:12 allusion offers further evidence of Hebrews' broader engagement with and deployment of the Song's imagery and message.

This engagement can also be demonstrated theologically. Deuteronomy 32:15 and 32:18 form a loose chiasmic structure:

- (15) Food (ἔφαγεν λακωβ)  
 Abandoned (ἐγκατέλιπεν θεὸν)  
 Birth (τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτὸν)  
 Forget (ἀπέστη ἀπὸ θεοῦ)
- (18) Forget (ἐγκατέλιπες)<sup>176</sup>  
 Birth (θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε)  
 Abandoned (ἐπελάθου θεοῦ)  
 Food (τοῦ τρέφοντός σε)

Deuteronomy 32:16-17 correspondingly depict the manner of Israel's apostasy. The primary sin is idolatry, but the language of the Deuteronomic translator (and even more so the proto-MT Hebrew original) anticipates and parallels vv19-21, where YHWH's punishment is explicated. The following figure illustrates their common terminology:

32:16-17 (15&18)	32:19-21
16: παρώξυνάν με	19: παρωξύνθη
16: ἐξεπίκρανάν <sup>177</sup> (MT: <b>סִיפֶּן</b> ) με <sup>178</sup>	21: παρεζήλωσάν <sup>179</sup> (MT: <b>סִיפֶּן</b> ) με

<sup>175</sup> Paul A. Barker, *The Triumph of Grace in Deuteronomy: Faithless Israel, Faithful Yahweh in Deuteronomy* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), passim, esp. 7-53 finds the faithful YHWH/faithless Israel dichotomy one of Deuteronomy's fundamental themes.

<sup>176</sup> It is notable that the Song pairs ἀφίστημι and ἐγκαταλείπω. Hebrews uses ἐγκαταλείπω in relation to both YHWH's support for the new community (13:5) and members drifting away from communal gatherings (10:25), evidence, one assumes, of the apostasy (ἀφίστημι) in 3:12.

<sup>177</sup> Παραζηλώω in Aquila.

<sup>178</sup> The MT text has a 3<sup>rd</sup> person form with 3<sup>rd</sup> person object pronoun.

16: ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίοις ἐν βδελύγμασιν <sup>180</sup> αὐτῶν	21: ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν
17: οὐ θεῶ	21: οὐ θεῶ

Furthermore, the explicit internal parallelism in 32:21 (παραζηλώω x2, παροργίζω x2, ἐπ' οὐ θεῶ/ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει) suggests that a similar parallel relationship be understood in that verse between ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις and ἐπ' ἔθνει ἄσυνέτω. Just as Israel has created jealousy through worshipping 'non-gods,' so YHWH will 'create jealousy' by a 'non-people'; similarly, just as Israel has angered God with idols, so God will anger Israel with a 'foolish nation' (32:21). 'Idols' and 'foolishness' are thus equated; the (foolish) agents of the punishment for apostasy (32:21) reflect the idolatry of which Israel is guilty. This is the same idolatrous behaviour found in vv16-17 and once more echoes the relationship between 32:16-17 and 32:19-21. In the theme verse of 32:6 Israel has already been described as foolish (נָבָל), the same label of the agents of divine judgment (32:21- נָבָל). Therefore "the punishment fits the crime",<sup>181</sup> one foolish people is to be punished by another. *The explicit theological premise of Deut 32:15-21 inscribes the punishment for apostasy (19-21) in the same terms or grounds as the actual apostasy committed (15-18).*<sup>182</sup>

Hebrews shares this 'like for like', quasi-*lex talionis* assessment of apostasy and punishment. With the addition of the emphatic διὸ (3:10, absent from most Ps 95:10 MSS), Hebrews specifically portrays the extent of Israel's apostasy as forty years. In 3:17, however, it suggests that YHWH's anger is equally forty years in duration; the punishment is clothed in the same terms as that of the disobedience.<sup>183</sup> The theological assessment of apostasy is thus shared; both Deut 32:15-21 and Heb 3:7-19 cast its consequences in the same terms as its content.

<sup>179</sup> The shared Hebrew root and the existence of παραξύνω in several MSS suggest a close relationship between the two verbs.

<sup>180</sup> βδελύγμα is normally associated with abominable practices, but can also be used of idols (Deut 7:26) – Sanders, *Provenance*, 182; cf. Deut 29:17 where it is treated interchangeably with εἶδωλον.

<sup>181</sup> Clements, *Book*, 141; see also Britt, *Rewriting*, 153-54; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 307-08; Levenson, "Inserted," 216-17. Cf. the similar reciprocity in 31:16-17 – just as Israel forsook YHWH, so he will forsake them.

<sup>182</sup> Ian Cairns, *Word and Presence: A Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* (ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 285 aptly calls the exchange "tit for tat."

<sup>183</sup> McCullough, "Quotations," 371-72.

### **3.2.2 Deut 17:6/Heb 10:28**

Hebrews 10:28-29 function as an *a fortiori* argument, akin to that in Heb 2:2-3. The grounds of the argument are the same in each case, the lesser example elucidated in terms of Mosaic principle, the greater pertaining to the ramifications of the new covenant dispensation. The context, structure and rhetoric of 10:28-29 have impressive parallels with certain Philonic texts,<sup>184</sup> but Hebrews differs from Philo by applying Deut 17:6 within a new covenant context.

Deut 17:6 LXX	Heb 10:28
ἐπὶ δυσὶν μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθανεῖται	ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωϋσέως χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει

The lack of IF requires that the citation of Deut 17:16 (Heb 10:28) be categorised as an allusion rather than quotation,<sup>185</sup> but its proximity to Deuteronomy's rendering remains nonetheless impressive.<sup>186</sup> Six successive words preserve the order of Deut 17:6, and Hebrews' minimal changes are probably attributable to stylistic preference. The absence of the first μάρτυσιν avoids an awkward and unnecessary repetition; the shift from a future ἀποθανεῖται to a present ἀποθνήσκει reflects the contemporary application of the Scriptural principle and may also parallel the ongoing present ἁμαρτανόντων (10:26).

Other parts of Deuteronomy, especially 19:15,<sup>187</sup> explain the requirement for a plurality of witnesses and the backdrop to the capital offence with its 'merciless judgment' (χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν, 10:28).<sup>188</sup> Yet 17:6 remains the most prominent text

---

<sup>184</sup> Cf. the examples in Attridge, *Epistle*, 293n24-25.

<sup>185</sup> Neither Katz, "Quotations," 213-23 nor Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.331 include it in their respective lists of Deuteronomic citations in the epistle. Howard, "Hebrews," 210 does include it, but erroneously refers to Heb 10:20. Moffatt, *Commentary*, 150 describes the reference as a "reminiscence," Schröger, *Verfasser*, 204 as an "Anspielung," Leonard, *Authorship*, 232 – perhaps most appropriately – as a "tacit quotation."

<sup>186</sup> Νόμον Μωϋσέως may be a specific naming of Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 1:5, 4:44; also 1 Kgs 2:3).

<sup>187</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.332 proposes that Deut 19:15-21 – rather than 17:6 – is the source for Heb 10:28.

<sup>188</sup> Deuteronomy 13:8(9), 19:13, 19:21, 25:12 – so Gordon, *Hebrews*, 122. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 537 adds Num 35:30 as a possible parallel case. Hermut Löhr, *Umkehr und Sünde im Hebräerbrief*

in Hebrews' reasoning, and its context deepens the argument outlined in Heb 10:28. The thematic similarities of 10:26-31 with 6:4-8 and 3:7-3:19 suggest that the author has in mind the specific sin of apostasy rather than sin in general and this accords with the context of the citation. Deut 17:2-3 concerns idolatry and apostasy and describes them as an offence against the covenant (17:2; cf. Heb 10:16, 29); such a background correlates both with the liturgical/covenantal offences of 10:29 and the potentially pernicious effect of even one unbeliever (cf. Heb 3:12-13).<sup>189</sup>

At the very least, Hebrews' appeal to Deut 17:6 displays its familiarity with the Deuteronomic tradition and the legal principles ensconced within it. Moreover, it also demonstrates the Deuteronomic re-presentation to which Hebrews addresses itself; once again, Deuteronomy provides the raw material for the hortatory task on which it embarks, with the practical repercussions of the new dispensation worked out in terms of Deuteronomic sanction. Rather than issue παράκλησις drawn *ex nihilo*, Hebrews instead appeals to an *a fortiori* continuity with the OT, and roots its exhortation in material drawn from the Deuteronomic corpus, the allusion to Deut 17:6 in 10:28 anticipating the double Deuteronomic warning in 10:30 (Deut 32:35-36). The rhetorical force of 17:6 denotes the serious consequences for rejecting the Son, and the scenario to which Heb 10:28/Deut 17:6 speaks remains the effective Deuteronomic choice between life and death (cf. Deut 30:15-20). To reject the new covenant offer is to face death (10:28), to be judged as an enemy of YHWH in the midst of his fire (10:27); to embrace it is to participate in the life of the living God (10:31).

### **3.2.3 Deut 1:10, 10:22, 28:62/Heb 11:12**

<b>Deut 1:10, 10:22, 28:62 MT</b>	<b>Deut 1:10, 10:22, 28:62 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 11:12</b>
כְּכֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם לִרְבּ	ὥσεὶ τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ	καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει

(BZNW 73; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 66n288 argues against extending the premise of Deut 17:16 to these other verses, on the grounds that either the ultimate sanction is not given (Deut 19:15) or that murder is not mentioned (Num. 35:30).

<sup>189</sup> Attention to Deut 17:6 may ameliorate the harshness of 10:28 and also restrict the verse's reference to the sin of idolatry/apostasy. Idolatry is an abomination in Israel (17:4), or an evil (17:7), a situation serious enough to warrant the plurality of witnesses (17:6).

	οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει	καὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναρίθμητος
--	-------------------	--

Whilst the complete lexical form of Heb 11:12 lacks any full LXX attestation, the closest, and hence probably the primary, referent is Gen 22:17.<sup>190</sup> Other sources are mooted (Gen 15:5,<sup>191</sup> Dan. 3:36 LXX,<sup>192</sup> Exod 32:13,<sup>193</sup> and a combination of Gen 15:5/22:17<sup>194</sup> or 22:17/32:13<sup>195</sup>) but Genesis 22:17 remains the most persuasive for four reasons: i) lexical affinity, ii) its immediate Akedah context (cf. Heb 11:17, the next 'event' in Hebrews' Abrahamic narrative), iii) its literal citation in 6:14, and iv) the way in which Gen 22 threatens the promise from its very inception. Bearing this in mind, it would be extremely unwise to overplay the Deuteronomic contribution to Heb 11:12, even though six consecutive words are shared (τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει).

Neither Gen 22:17, however, nor the related Gen 15:6/32:13, fully account for the form attested in Heb 11:12, in particular the qualifier τῷ πλήθει. The phrase is hinted at in Gen 32:13 (ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, MT: כַּרְמִי), but the precise form is only found in Exod 32:13, Deut 1:10, 10:22, and 28:62; the first part of the promise is actually closer to these verses than any in Genesis. Exodus 32:13 has echoes in Heb 11:8-12,<sup>196</sup> but its MT reading lacks the critical כַּרְמִי, thereby rendering the Deuteronomic texts, in their Masoretic form at least, the closest rendering to the Greek of the first part of the Abrahamic promise. It has been suggested that these textual differences are a temporary oversight on the author's part,<sup>197</sup> an option

<sup>190</sup> Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 194; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 172; Guthrie, *Hebrews (TNTC)*, 233.

<sup>191</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 591. Its lack of lexical correspondence – compared with the high degree in Gen 22:17 – makes the role of Gen 15:5 far less persuasive.

<sup>192</sup> This appears to be a strong allusion to, almost a direct citation of, Gen 22:17. The only difference between the two texts is the variant form ἀστήρ/ἄστρον.

<sup>193</sup> Leonard, *Authorship*, 235.

<sup>194</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 296-97; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 207.

<sup>195</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 398.

<sup>196</sup> Exodus 32:13 extends the promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, similarly described by Heb 11:9 as συγγληρονόμοι of the promise.

<sup>197</sup> Cf. Lane, *Hebrews*, 355: "It is probable that the writer was quoting from memory at this point."

vaguely conceivable in that Heb 11 is notably absent of formal quotations.<sup>198</sup> Yet Hebrews' attention to detail is generally consistent elsewhere in the letter, and the appeal to forgetfulness seems unnecessary when another suitable option is available.

Some attention to the function of the promise in Deuteronomy seems reasonable. In 1:10, the emphasis is on its fulfilment (the emphatic 'σήμερον'),<sup>199</sup> similarly so in 10:22, where *οὐκ ἔστιν* δὲ emphasizes YHWH's achievement of it. In 28:62, part of the covenantal curses, the converse of the promise is encountered; failure to listen to YHWH's voice (cf. Heb 2:1, 3:7, 3:15-16, 4:7; also cf. Heb 11:8) will lead to Israel being reduced in number (ἐν ἀριθμῷ βραχέϊ), expelled from the land and ultimately destroyed (28:63). In Deuteronomy, the promise thus embraces the classic tension between expectation of blessing and the cursed consequences of apostasy.

It is conceivable that, behind the primary allusion to Gen 22:17, an astute audience would have been aware of this tension. They are exhorted to replicate Abraham's faithfulness because they know the full story; the fact that God has *already* demonstrated his faithfulness in fulfilling the promise (cf. Deut 1:10; Heb 10:23, 11:11) gives them confidence to act like Abraham.<sup>200</sup> Abraham himself did receive – in part – what had been promised him (6:15),<sup>201</sup> and the audience should model his example of patient πίστις in anticipation of receiving what has been promised them (cf. the double use of μακροθυμία in 6:12, 6:15). Conversely, the negative consequences of disdaining the promise also implicitly linger in the background. Cursing, rejection and judgment await those who spurn the ἐφάπαξ divine undertaking.

---

<sup>198</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 90.

<sup>199</sup> Deuteronomy 1:11 probably reflects a desire for future blessing, rather than (in the light of 1:9) querying the fulfilment of the promise, as such fulfilment seems indubitably understood by 1:10 (cf. the dual use of *וְיָרֵם*). Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 137 is probably correct to suggest that 1:11 counters any suggestion of dissatisfaction on Moses' part in 1:9.

<sup>200</sup> This contradicts neither the notion that the heroes' eschatological perfection comes *μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν* (11:39) nor the implication that the reception of the promise is ultimately understood christologically (cf. 9:15). God's better plan does not negate a testimonial role for the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise in Deuteronomy; rather the latter, through the allusion in Heb 11:12, provides confirmation of YHWH's ability to bring about something better for both the μαρτυρηθέντες and their successors (cf. 12:1).

<sup>201</sup> As with the previous note, 6:15 does not contradict 11:13. Abraham received the promise of Isaac, though was not privy to the full outworking of the divine promise. See Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 338-39.

### 3.2.4 Deut 8:5/Heb 12:7<sup>202</sup>

Deut 8:5 LXX	Heb 12:7
ὥς εἴ τις παιδεύσαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ οὕτως κύριος ὁ θεός σου παιδεύσει σε	εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, ὥς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός. τίς γὰρ υἱὸς ὃν οὐ παιδεύει πατήρ

With its hortatory exposition of Prov 3:11-12, Heb 12:5-11 establishes παιδεία as a prerequisite of divine sonship, a necessary, formative aspect of the audience's pilgrimage. Sonship without παιδεία means illegitimacy (12:8), but for those who endure it, there is the eschatological promise of life (12:9), holiness (12:10), peace, and righteousness (12:11). The allusion to Deut 8:5 in Heb 12:7 is not so much premised upon lexical affiliation, but rather on both texts' common mode of comparison. Each text formulates a father/son-God/παιδεία contrast that articulates the formative benefits of YHWH's discipline.<sup>203</sup> Divine agency of παιδεία is a common LXX phenomenon (cf. Lev 26:18, 23; Pss 37:2, 93:12 LXX), as is the use of παιδεύω in relation to father/son interaction (Prov 13:24, 23:13; Sir 6:32, 30:2, 30:13). Likewise, both the efficacious (Ps 17:36 LXX; Wis 3:5) and punitive (Lev 26:18, 23; Pss 6:2, 38:12 LXX) aspects of παιδεία are well represented in Jewish literature. The combination, however, of father/son imagery with divine παιδεία (12:7) is a rare occurrence within the material, and is explicitly formulated only in Deut 8:5.<sup>204</sup>

<sup>202</sup> Commentators rarely associate Deut 8:5 with 12:5-11. A notable exception is Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.391.

<sup>203</sup> Hebrews has previously alluded to Israel's filial status (1:6) and associated the audience's experience with that of wilderness Israel (3:7-19); this may have occasioned reflection upon Deut 8:5, where Israel, YHWH's beloved son (cf. Heb 12:6), experiences an extended wilderness period of paternal παιδεία. Cf. Terry L. Burden, *The Kerygma of the Wilderness Traditions in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 117: "In Deuteronomy, the period used to illustrate the father-son relationship is the wilderness." Of further interest is the similarity between Deut 8:2-6 and Deut 32; both deal with the issue of YHWH's discipline – see MacDonald, *Monotheism*, 148-49, 213.

<sup>204</sup> Whilst God is never identified explicitly as 'father' in 12:7, the logic of the comparison strongly implies it.

The similarity between the respective comparisons is acute. God is the agent of the παιδεία in both instances,<sup>205</sup> and assumes a fatherly function in each case. Hebrews particularly emphasizes the paternal relationship, addressing the quotation to 'my son' (12:5);<sup>206</sup> this "obscures the quality of analogy inherent in the MT, and the verse becomes testimony to actual adoption by God, .... rather than a useful analogy for describing God's chastening ('like a father')." <sup>207</sup> In each verse, the audience are addressed as the filial recipients of the παιδεία; the παράκλησις of 12:5-11 is not the audience's actual suffering (Prov 3:11-12 LXX offers no encouragement that such suffering is inherently beneficial), but rather their filial status, correlative with the position of wilderness Israel, whose heirs they have become. The Son is the paradigm; as the one who has been tested (2:18, 4:15), he can help those being tested (2:18).<sup>208</sup>

The appropriateness of the allusion comes not just from the uniqueness of the comparison, but also from the compelling parallels between the respective interpretations of the παιδεία. In its original context, Prov 3:11-12 stands in the tradition of necessary divine punishment; the language of μαστιγοῖ, in particular, depicts the παιδεία as punitive, harsh and deserved.<sup>209</sup> Its quotation in Hebrews, however, revises that disciplinary perspective; as παράκλησις, the Prov 3 παιδεία becomes a formative experience, one that is educational, purposeful and ultimately

---

<sup>205</sup> This is explicit in Deut 8:5; YHWH is the subject of παιδεύσει. In Hebrews, it is almost explicit; whilst the παιδεία could possibly be enacted by the community's enemies (12:4), the comparative logic of 12:7 implies that the subject of παιδεύσει extends to ὁ θεός. Similarly in 12:10, the referent of ἐπαίδευον carries over to the pronoun 'ὁ, θεός understood. Παιδείας κυρίου (12:5) is likewise a subjective genitive.

<sup>206</sup> Μου is absent in the LXX, but present in MT. Hebrews is not accommodating to the MT, for this would require also changing 12:6, but rather personalizes the exhortation – Thomas, "Citations," 317.

<sup>207</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 448; so also Günther Bornkamm, "Sonschaft und Leiden," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (ed. Walter Eltester; BZNW 26; Berlin: Topelmann, 1960), 196-97, contra Michel, *Brief*, 438.

<sup>208</sup> Bornkamm, "Sonschaft," 188-98 rightly stresses the centrality of *Sohnschaft* in the pericope (υἱός appears 6 times), even if his negation of any theodicean element overstates the case (12:4-11 is an exhortation not to fade away (12:3), to keep going in the expectation of the rewards of holiness and peace (12:10-11)). Cf. the criticism of Otto Michel, "Zur Auslegung des Hebräerbriefes," *NovT* 6 (1963): 190-91; Lane, *Hebrews*, 419; Jukka Thurén, "Gebet und Gehorsam des Erniedrigten," *NovT* 13 (1971): 139). Deuteronomy 8:2-5 also has a theodicean dimension, explaining YHWH's testing of Israel in the wilderness. However, *Sohnschaft* remains the primary motif and the absence of christological language in 12:5-11 is insufficient basis for rejecting its significance here. Sonship – and not christology – is the referent in Deut 8:2-5, and similarly so in Heb 12:5-11. Cf. Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 177: "suffering and sonship belong together."

<sup>209</sup> Croy, *Endurance*, 196-97.



beneficial.<sup>210</sup> It remains occasionally painful (12:11), but is nonetheless formative<sup>211</sup> rather than punitive.<sup>212</sup> There is no hint in 12:4-11 of any sin for which the community are receiving divine recompense.<sup>213</sup>

This nurturing sense to παιδεία is shared by Deut 8:2-5, which Croy notes to be one of the few OT examples where παιδεία is understood positively or formatively.<sup>214</sup> Some of Deut 8:2-5's language may appear harsh; κακός (Deut 8:2-3; MT כָּלֵל), for example, is clearly severe and is commonly used of slavery (Gen 15:3; Exod 1:11; Num 20:15) and judgment upon YHWH's enemies (Josh 24:5; Jer 51:27 LXX), without necessarily inviting any hope of redemption (Ruth 1:21, 2 Macc 5:22). But the pericope's broad context is YHWH's sustenance of wilderness Israel and his regular provision of food and clothing (8:3-4) hardly bears the mark of divine punishment. As with Heb 12:5-11, the divine παιδεία of Deut 8:2-5 is not occasioned by sin; its purpose is rather to test Israel (ἐκπειράση, 8:2) such that they acknowledge their dependence upon their God.<sup>215</sup> The formative nature of παιδεία is similarly evident in Deut 11:2, whose scope could be construed as incorporating the whole exodus and wilderness experience of Israel.<sup>216</sup> It is only punitive in the

---

<sup>210</sup> Croy, *Endurance*, 192-209.

<sup>211</sup> So deSilva, *Perseverance*, 449-50; Croy, *Endurance*, 198-99.

<sup>212</sup> So Wilson, *Hebrews*, 222; G. Bertram, "Παιδεύω," *TDNT* 5:596-625.

<sup>213</sup> Πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι (12:4) is best understood as the sinful action of those acting against the community (so Braun, *Hebräer*, 408-09; Lane, *Hebrews*, 418-19; Croy, *Endurance*, 194), rather than that of the audience itself (so Koester, *Hebrews*, 526). Koester proposes that the audience's own sin is the subject of 12:1-17, but this is true only of 12:14f; 12:13 marks a clear end to the argument of 12:1-13. Whereas 12:1-13 is a positive exhortation to faithful endurance, 12:14-17 is sombre warning against apostasy and faithlessness.

<sup>214</sup> Croy, *Endurance*, 94. I am assuming that 'probative' and 'formative' are essentially synonymous, as Croy subsequently describes Deut 8's view of suffering as 'formative' (*Endurance*, 95). DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 449n4 seems to differentiate between the two adjectives, but we shall treat them interchangeably, as both view discipline as facilitating a change or improvement in behaviour. Deuteronomy commentators generally share this formative view of παιδεία in Deut 8:1-5. See Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 186; Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 114-18; Barker, *Triumph*, 65; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 93n5. The latter compares Deut 8:5 with Prov 3:11-12. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy* is less consistent, seeing it as both punishment (390) and educational (396).

<sup>215</sup> Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 185-86 notes how, in the Matthean temptation narrative (4:1-11), Jesus relies upon Deuteronomy for his scriptural citation (6:16, 8:3, 6:13). This suggests that Matthew, at least, understood the Deuteronomic wilderness experience as formation rather than punishment. It is also possible that the Jesus temptation narrative is in the background of Heb 12:4-11.

<sup>216</sup> The syntax of 11:2-6 is not straightforward and the list of divine actions in 11:2b-6 could be seen as in apposition to the opening τὴν παιδείαν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου. Wevers, *Notes*, 188 proposes that παιδεία denotes "the manifestation of divine power both in Egypt and on the desert journeys." See also Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 186.

cases of Dathan and Abiram, whose sin is made clear; for those addressed by Moses, the experience is essentially educational and preparatory.<sup>217</sup> Indeed, the LXX exemplifies its educational value by a subtle wordplay: the audience's sons (παῖδία; MT בְּנֵיכֶם) have not witnessed the discipline (παῖδείαν) of YHWH.

Bearing in mind Hebrews' non-contextual exposition of the quotation, Croy ventures that Prov 3:11-12 is specifically selected because it provides a convenient textual exemplar containing the three key elements (father, son and παῖδεία) upon which Hebrews can subsequently elaborate. This solution is certainly possible, and the author is not averse to exegetical word play if it suits his purpose (cf. 7:2). However, if Hebrews is working within a Deuteronomic paradigm (particularly here Deut 8:2-5), then it is also conceivable that the exposition of Prov 3:11-12 replicates the tenor of that overarching paradigm;<sup>218</sup> i.e. Hebrews exegetes the quotation on the basis of Deut 8:2-5.<sup>219</sup> In both texts, the goal of παῖδεία is 'life' (Deut 8:1; Heb 12:9),<sup>220</sup> possibly to be equated with the exhortation of Deut 30:15-19 to 'choose life'.<sup>221</sup> Both texts are also aware of the harsh nature of the discipline, and that hardship may precede the coming eschatological gifts (Deut 8:2-3; Heb 12:6, 12:11).

Hebrews 12:7 uses Deuteronomy with a hortatory purpose, but notably here in an optimistic sense (contrast 10:26-31). More 'negative' Deuteronomic material will follow in 12:15-19, but in 12:5-11 at least, Deuteronomy is used affirmatively to encourage the tiring new covenant community (12:12-13). The wilderness years (if not the wilderness generation itself) are viewed with high regard.<sup>222</sup> Just as that

---

<sup>217</sup> Cf. also Deut 32:10: YHWH watched over (ἐπαίδευσεν) Israel in the wilderness (though the MT root is יָצַב rather than יָדַע (8:5, 11:2)). Elsewhere in Deuteronomy παῖδεία is understood punitively (21:18, 22:18). As with παῖδεία, יָדַע can have both the positive and negative connotations, so context must dictate its meaning.

<sup>218</sup> *Sif. Deut* 32.5 connects the two texts and places them in direct apposition. Croy, *Endurance*, 94 suggests several other (wisdom) sources (Wis 3:1-12, 11:1-14; 12:19-22; Sir 2:1-6; 4:17) in which παῖδεία is viewed formatively, but none of these references share the explicit father/son language nor make the God/you-father/son comparison exhibited by Deut 8:5 and Heb 12:7.

<sup>219</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.391 lacks this precise terminology, but nonetheless discusses Deut 8:2-5 and its paradigmatic exposition of filial education at the outset of his exposition of 12:5-11. Similarly, Wright, *Deuteronomy (NIBC)*, 125 speculates that Deut 8:2-5, along with the Gethsemane tradition, might have formed the backdrop for Heb 12:7-11.

<sup>220</sup> 'Life' does have telic significance in Prov 3 itself (3:2, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21-22) – Gordon, *Hebrews*, 152.

<sup>221</sup> So Lane, *Hebrews*, 424; also Peterson, *Hebrews*, 174.

<sup>222</sup> Hebrews 3:9-10 probably also exhibits a positive appreciation of the wilderness era and YHWH's faithful provision during the forty years – deSilva, *Perseverance*, 142n16; Enns, "Creation," 274.

generation were upheld and proven as 'sons' through testing, so the Hebrews audience are similarly reminded of their filial status and the formative value of divine discipline.<sup>223</sup>

### **3.2.5 Deut 29:18b/Heb 12:15b**

Deut 29:17 MT	Deut 29:18 LXX	Heb 12:15b
פֶּן יִשׁ בְּכֶם שִׂרְשׁ פֶּרַח רֹאשׁ וּלְעֵנָה	μή τις ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ρίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ	μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ

Hebrews 12:15b addresses the effect of a sinful, probably apostate, individual on the rest of the community (cf. Gal 5:9; 1 Cor 5:6; Acts 8:23).<sup>224</sup> It is the second of three interdependent, parallel μή τις clauses (12:15a, 12:15b, 12:16-17), each premised upon the opening ἐπισκοποῦντες.<sup>225</sup> The respective hortatory clauses increase in length, depth of warning and specific consequence, yet still function corporately, addressing the impact of an individual's apostasy upon the community. Where 12:14 exhorted the audience to peace *with one another*, 12:15-17 elucidates the pernicious mutual 'non-peace' that apostasy engenders, causing the ritual defilement of other community members.<sup>226</sup>

That Deut 29:18 and Heb 12:15 are in some fashion related, few commentators would dispute. The nature of the relationship, however, is debated,

<sup>223</sup> Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 173. We thus differ from Löhr, *Umkehr*, 289n755 who confines the wilderness generation paradigm just to chs. 3-4. For a more practical reading of Heb 12 against the backdrop of wilderness Israel, see Bill Kellermann, "The Curse and Blessing of the Wilderness: The Risky Inheritance of Hebrews," *Sojourners* 14, no. 6 (1985): 24-27.

<sup>224</sup> Acts 8:23 is especially notable for its linguistic similarity to Heb 12:15 – χολὴν πικρίας.

<sup>225</sup> The three clauses are read in parallel; contra Héring, *L'Épître*, 116 who suggests that ἐνοχλῇ has two subjects.

<sup>226</sup> Whether or not πολλοί is anarthous (i.e. whether apostasy affects most or all the community) is disputed, but the weight of textual witness and Hebrews' general fondness for omitting the article suggests only πολλοί should be read (cf. Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 53-54). The key conclusion remains, however, that apostasy has an effect above and beyond the individual who occasions it.

and has been variously labelled as a citation,<sup>227</sup> allusion,<sup>228</sup> echo<sup>229</sup> or recontextualisation.<sup>230</sup> The lack of a formal IF and the variant wording in the two texts mitigates against classifying Heb 12:15b as a quotation. However, the strong lexical correspondence, and the impressive contextual and theological similarities between Heb 12:15 and its source suggest that, at the very least, a strong allusion to Deut 29:18 is being formulated.

Textual issues lie at the root of the debate, with MT and LXX attesting variant readings. Deut 29:17b MT reads **שֶׁרֶשׁ פֶּרֶה רָאֵשׁ וּלְעֵנָה** – i.e. 'a root bearing poisonous and bitter fruit'; the Septuagint translator, perhaps unhappy with the idea of human fruit-bearing, preferred the notion of 'growing upwards' (ἄνω φύουσα). Similarly, rather than being fruit produced by the root, gall and wormwood become the context in which the root grows; hence Deut 29:18b LXX reads 'growing up in/among gall and bitterness'.<sup>231</sup> Unsurprisingly perhaps, such variation has a knock-on effect within the Greek tradition. The primary variants of Deut 29:18b are as follows:<sup>232</sup>

<b>G M Θ</b>	μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ
<b>B*</b>	μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ
<b>F</b>	μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ
<b>A F*</b>	μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ

A is clearly closest to Heb 12:15b; if it were the source text, Hebrews has either ignored or tidied up the "syntactically impossible"<sup>233</sup> καὶ πικρίᾳ, but preserved the genitive πικρίας modifying ῥίζα. However, neither Wevers nor Rahlfs embrace

<sup>227</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 368; Nairne, *Epistle*, 412; Theodore H. Robinson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931), 186; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.332 labels it a "citation virtuelle."

<sup>228</sup> Schröger, *Verfasser*, 205 (lit. "Anspielung"); Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 663.

<sup>229</sup> Wilson, *Hebrews*, 227; Manson, *Epistle*, 85.

<sup>230</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 460.

<sup>231</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 470-71; Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 301.

<sup>232</sup> Listed in Michel, *Brief*, 454n1; Casey, "Eschatology", 105.

<sup>233</sup> Michel, *Brief*, 454n1.

Alexandrinus' reading (they both follow G/M/Θ), and A differs similarly from the MT. Three solutions to the textual problem may be offered:

- a) Hebrews inherited an already 'corrupted' Deut 29:17 *Vorlage*,<sup>234</sup> possibly, but not necessarily, the A tradition,<sup>235</sup> whose rendering he merely reconstituted in the epistolary text. This option necessitates the existence of a separate Greek textual tradition, but accounts for what would otherwise be peculiar changes to the text by Hebrews.
- b) Hebrews itself initiates the change.<sup>236</sup> That all the alterations are his handiwork is, however, unlikely in view of both his *Vorlage* handling elsewhere, and the odd syntactic change that it would occasion. More conceivable is that the corrupt ἐνοχλῆ was already present in the text and Hebrews has 'tidied' the source up by shifting the redundant πικρία to become a genitive πικρίας.<sup>237</sup>
- c) The corruption postdates Hebrews' composition, and is manifested within the Hebrews/NT tradition.<sup>238</sup> This corruption has a subsequent domino effect upon LXX transmission, with A following the misreading initiated by Hebrews' copyists. This option has been most comprehensively articulated by Katz, who proposes that the original reading of both Deut 29:18 and Heb 12:15 was indeed ἐν χολῇ, the verse thereby reading μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ. In addition to the tempting ENX[.]AH in P46, Katz's premise was partly Hebrews' desire for lexical brevity, partly the way in which ἐνοχλῆ interrupts three putatively verbless parallel anaphoric clauses introduced by μή τις.<sup>239</sup>

Katz' conjecture is a plausible attempt to solve a complex textual problem, but is ultimately not persuasive. Even he admits that the attestation for ἐνοχλῆ is

---

<sup>234</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 368; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 664; Michaelis, "Πικρός, πικρία, πικραίνω, παραπικραίνω, παραπικρασμός," *TDNT* 6:122-27; Koester, *Hebrews*, 532; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 219.

<sup>235</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.400; Friedrich Bleek, *Der Hebräerbrief* (Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1868), 471; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 210.

<sup>236</sup> This seems to be proposed by Wevers, *Notes*, 471.

<sup>237</sup> Braun, *Hebräer*, 425.

<sup>238</sup> Hughes, *Commentary*, 539; Katz, "Quotations," 213-17; Schröger, *Verfasser*, 205; BDF §165.

<sup>239</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 213-27.

"certainly unanimous";<sup>240</sup> the lack of substantial textual support (P46 notwithstanding), and the fact that ἐνοχλῆ is the harder reading, makes his suggestion at best an "attractive alternative,"<sup>241</sup> but not a compelling option. Instead, the simplest explanation is a), especially if we take seriously the significance of the OT allusion and its affinity with the respective textual forms. Alexandrinus is – in terms of meaning at least – closer to the MT than the LXX,<sup>242</sup> for the latter has no suggestion that the ῥίζα might itself be bitter or provoke bitterness. On the contrary, it describes how the individual might be affected by the apostasy of others, the reverse of Hebrews/A/MT's conception. The allusion only works thematically with the so-called 'corrupted' Greek form of Deut 29:18, suggesting that Hebrews' *Vorlage* had already diverted from the text form attested in the LXX.<sup>243</sup>

Such textual complexity and variation, however, only compounds the notion that Heb 12:15b and Deut 29:18 are in some way intertwined. Structurally, Heb 12:15 replicates the two μή τις clauses of Deut 29:18; by adding a third clause in 12:16, Hebrews both enhances the relationship and includes the paradigmatic Esau discourse (12:16-17) within the scope of the Deuteronomic warning.<sup>244</sup> The respective contexts are similarly consistent and Deut 29:18f facilitates interpretation of the Hebrews passage.<sup>245</sup> Deuteronomy 29 is the affirmation of the Moabite covenant; as with Heb 12:15-17, it espouses warnings regarding the consequences of rejecting this (new) YHWH-initiated covenant.<sup>246</sup> Both texts focus upon an unforgivable sin (Deut 29:20; Heb 12:16-17), a parallel we will discuss further in the next chapter. Most impressive, however, is the texts' shared discussion of the potentially pernicious effect of the apostasy of even one member of the community upon the rest,<sup>247</sup> a theme common to both Deut 29:18-19 and Heb 12:15b.<sup>248</sup>

---

<sup>240</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 214.

<sup>241</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 439h.

<sup>242</sup> Michel, *Brief*, 454n1 notes the Semitic structure of the phrase; such appeal to Semitic origins may overplay the similarities (cf. the critique of Michaelis, *TDNT* 6:125n1) but the parallels between the MT and the Heb 12:15b are highly persuasive.

<sup>243</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 471 correctly observes: Heb 12:15b is "a fine sentiment, but not that of Deut."

<sup>244</sup> See 4.2.2.

<sup>245</sup> Guthrie, *Hebrews (NIV)*, 409.

<sup>246</sup> On the 'newness' of the Moab covenant, see 4.1.3.

<sup>247</sup> Deuteronomy 29:18b MT (למען ספות הרוה את הצמאה) is problematic; it either continues the apostate's speech or presents a narrational comment anticipating 29:19 (הרוה is either the subject or

Although most commentators label ῥίζα πικρίας a genitive of quality<sup>249</sup> or descriptive genitive,<sup>250</sup> such appellations perhaps misplace the effect of the bitterness.<sup>251</sup> Both passages emphasize the 'fruit' or 'crop' of the root (i.e. its negative effect upon other community members: 12:15c; Deut 29:19)<sup>252</sup> and ῥίζα πικρίας may be better rendered as a 'root that leads to bitterness'; both the root and its 'crop' are ultimately bitter and sow the seeds of rebellion.<sup>253</sup> A contrast is drawn with 12:11 (καρπὸν εἰρηνικόν), between the different fruits produced by the community's respective actions.

Some commentators explain πικρία in terms of the persecution being experienced by the community,<sup>254</sup> disillusionment with the Christian life,<sup>255</sup> or (bizarrely) as a polemic against marriage.<sup>256</sup> Bearing in mind the broad context of Deut 29:18-21, however, such explanations are unnecessary; 'bitterness' is rather the negative effect that apostasy (or, in Deuteronomic terms, idolatry) has upon the rest of the congregation.<sup>257</sup> Ἐνοχλέω can have the concept of troubling/rebellion (cf. 1

---

object of תַּפְסֹס). The LXX introduces a negative element (μὴ), understands the phrase as the narrator's words and changes the metaphorical 'watered/dry' language to sinner/innocent categories. The implication is that the sinner's actions potentially occasion the simultaneous demise of the non-apostate. On the various syntactical issues, see Marguerite Harl, "Le Pêché Irrémissible de L'Idolâtre Arrogant: Dt 29,19-20 dans la Septante et chez d'autres Témoins.," in *Tradition of the Text* (ed. Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano; OBO 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 63-78. 1QS 2.14 ascribes both the 'dryness' and the 'wateredness' (with lies) to the apostate individual, not the community.

<sup>248</sup> Löhr, *Umkehr*, 120-21, 238. The potential apostate of Deut 29:19a notably assumes for *himself* the holiness (ῥόσιος) that Hebrews expects to be a sought after quality (12:14).

<sup>249</sup> BDF §165; Michaelis, *TDNT* 6:125n1; Löhr, *Umkehr*, 119n586.

<sup>250</sup> Wallace, *Grammar*, 81.

<sup>251</sup> A distinction well made by Casey, "Eschatology", 109-10; cf. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 507.

<sup>252</sup> Löhr, *Umkehr*, 121n591. However, the Deuteronomic borrowing goes only so far; the cultic context of μισθῶσιν is Hebrews' own contribution.

<sup>253</sup> To emphasize this important distinction, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 664 describes the 'root' as a 'shoot' (so also Braun, *Hebräer*, 425; contra BDAG). Michel, *Brief*, 455 suggests that the root is an antichrist counter to the messianic root of Jesse (Isa 11:1), but this is unpersuasive given the Deuteronomic context of Heb 12:15.

<sup>254</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 368; although the agent of the bitterness would seem to be internal to the community, it may have been inaugurated by external opposition.

<sup>255</sup> Gordon, *Hebrews*, 154. Such disillusionment may be causative of the apostasy.

<sup>256</sup> Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 217-19.

<sup>257</sup> Braun, *Hebräer*, 425; cf. I. Howard Marshall, *Kept by the Power of God: A Study of Perseverance and Falling Away* (London: Epworth, 1969), 149-50.

Esdras 2:17, 24) or causing sickness (cf. Luke 6:18; Gen 48:1; 1 Sam 19:14, 30:13); with ῥίζα πικρίας as subject, it would denote the objective causative effect individual apostasy has upon the community, rather than any subjective psychological condition experienced by an individual member. This is conversant with Hebrews' earlier use of πικρία forms in elucidating the detrimental effects of the wilderness generation's apostasy and rebellion (παραπικρασμός, 3:8, 3:15; παραπικραίνω, 3:16),<sup>258</sup> and is supported by textual parallels at Qumran which tie Deut 29:18 to the same unbelieving heart against which Hebrews warns (3:10, 3:12).<sup>259</sup>

Ellingworth proposes that "(t)he wider context of Deut 29:17 is widely used in Hebrews"<sup>260</sup> and this seems particularly demonstrable in relation to Deut 29's discussion of apostasy.<sup>261</sup> The sin of Deut 29:19 is portrayed as apostasy, initiated by a deceitful heart (ἐν τῇ ἀποπλανήσει τῆς καρδίας, Deut 29:19; cf. Heb 3:10, ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ).<sup>262</sup> Likewise, Deut 29:20 (ἐκκαυθήσεται ὀργῇ κυρίου καὶ ὁ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ) recalls the imagery of Heb 10:27 (πυρὸς ζῆλος) in regard to the fearful divine judgment, which leads to the burning of the land (κατακεκαυμένον πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, Deut 29:23; cf. Heb 6:7-8, γῆ .... εἰς καὶ σιν). Such parallels suggest the possibility that Hebrews is drawing a purposeful connection between Israel assembled on the Moabite plain and the new covenant audience; Deut 29 would provide an appropriate source, since its own text sets forth (new) covenantal obligations to future generations of Israel (29:15) and anticipates apostasy within the

---

<sup>258</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 531.

<sup>259</sup> Cf. 1QH 12:14, where the 'root of bitterness' is equated with a 'stubborn heart' within the broad context of idolatry. A similar interweaving of apostasy, idolatry and a 'stubborn heart' is drawn in 1QS 2:13-14, where the passage cited is Deut 29:19-20. This Qumranic usage of Deut 29 in relation to apostasy/rebellion adds credibility to similar usage in Heb 12:15, but neither Qumran text anticipates a negative effect on other members of the community; it is the apostate individual alone whose fate is cursed.

<sup>260</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 664. His 29:17 is Wevers' 29:18. A number of the parallels are also noted by Dunnill, *Covenant*, 130-31.

<sup>261</sup> See Scot McKnight, "The Warning Passages of Hebrews: A Formal Analysis and Theological Conclusions," *TJ* 13 (1992): 39. Bjørn Sandvik, *Das Kommen des Herrn Beim Abendmahl im Neuen Testament* (ATANT 58; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970), 107 suggests that 12:15 warns against "Verfälschen und Irrlehren", but this misses the focus, here and in the other warning passages, of the dangers of apostasy and its effect on the whole community. Apostasy may be nurtured by false doctrine, but 12:15 emphasises the interaction between community members, not the teaching promulgated.

<sup>262</sup> For F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 350, the best commentary on Heb 12:15b is Heb 3:12. His insight is apt, as both verses exhibit Deuteronomical allusions.



community's ranks (29:22-28). We will revisit this connection in the subsequent chapters, but, for the present, we can concur with Löhr that "(d)er Kontext von Dtn 29, der Moses-Rede im Lande Moab an ganz Israel, wird im Hebr mit diesem Hinweis auf die Gefährdung der Gesamtgemeinde aufgenommen."<sup>263</sup> Where 12:5-11 appeals to Israel's wilderness experiences to demonstrate how divine παιδεία ratifies the audience's sonship (Deut 8:2-5), so 12:15-17 (and 12:15 in particular) makes similar appeal to Israel's apostasy to illustrate how such sonship can be abrogated.<sup>264</sup>

### **3.2.6 Deut 4:11-12, 5:22-27/Heb 12:18-21**

<b>Deut 4:11-12 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 12:18-19</b>
καὶ προσήλθετε καὶ ἕστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος καὶ τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρὶ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ σκότος γνόφος θύελλα φωνὴ μεγάλη καὶ ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρός φωνήν ῥημάτων ὑμεῖς ἠκούσατε	Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ καὶ γνόφῳ καὶ ζόφῳ καὶ θυέλλῃ καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων, ἥς οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρητήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον

Although neither 'Sinai' nor 'mountain' are explicitly mentioned in 12:18,<sup>265</sup> the sensory evocation of the Horeb theophany within 12:18-21 is indisputable in view of its subsequent parallel with Mount Zion. Hebrews' description recaptures the imagery of Sinai, drawing extensively on accounts of the theophany in Exod 19:12-22, 20:18-21 and Deut 4:11-12, 5:22-27. The wilderness backdrop has been present thus far in the chapter (12:5-11; 12:15-17) and its imagery remains at the forefront of the depiction of Sinai.

<sup>263</sup> Löhr, *Umkehr*, 120-21.

<sup>264</sup> Pace Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.403, who contends that 12:15-17 is merely parenthetical, γὰρ (12:18) therefore continuing the thought of 12:14.

<sup>265</sup> The best MSS lack both words; the omission of ὄρει probably emphasizes the supremacy of the Zion dispensation (12:22 contrastingly has the full phrase Σιών ὄρει) and the symbolic demise of the Sinai era (Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.403).

Hebrews 12:18 is especially dependent upon Deuteronomic imagery. The mode of approach – (οὐ) προσεληλύθατε (Heb 12:18, 22) – derives from Israel's arrival at Sinai as related in Deuteronomy (4:11); the tense change and negation emphasize Hebrews' assessment of Sinai's 'outdated' or obsolete status. In Deut 4:11, προσεληλύθατε is understood as 'drawn near', rather than 'arrived' and this sense befits Heb 12:18-21's assessment of Sinai's accessibility; Israel stood at the foot of the mountain (ἔστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος), but were unable physically to ascend it (cf. Heb 12:20).<sup>266</sup> Elsewhere in the letter, προσέρχομαι is used of drawing near to the presence of God, particularly for cultic and liturgical purposes (4:16, 7:25, 10:22, 11:6),<sup>267</sup> and this may likewise reflect Moses' ascent of Horeb into YHWH's presence (προσέρχομαι, Deut 5:27).

Linguistically at least, the application of ψηλαφωμένῳ to the Sinai scene is not ostensibly drawn from Septuagint theophany sources.<sup>268</sup> Its most likely source is Exod 10:21, where the darkness is described as ψηλαφητὸν<sup>269</sup> (cf. Exod 10:22, where it is further depicted as σκότος γνόφος θύελλα – cf. Heb 12:18); Hebrews seemingly draws upon the intense gloom of the ninth plague to enhance the awesomeness of the Sinai theophany. The subsequent κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ restores the Horeb provenance to the imagery of 12:18, but its Deuteronomic precision is dependent upon the overall syntactic analysis of ψηλαφωμένῳ καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ. Dependent upon how one divides the phrase, five readings are possible, of which the first is the most preferable:

---

<sup>266</sup> Translating προσεληλύθατε (12:22) likewise ('you have come near to'), correlates well with the Deuteronomic perspective upon entry to Canaan; Israel stood at its threshold, but have yet to enter fully into it.

<sup>267</sup> Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 27-32. Johannes Schneider, "Ἔρχομαι," *TDNT* 2:666-84 describes its usage in Hebrews as "purely cultic." For an alternative view, that προσέρχομαι should be understood as an act of faith in Christ, see Peterson, *Hebrews*, 161; William J. Dumbrell, "Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect," *Evangelical Quarterly* 48 (1976): 155. In view of the Deut 4:11/5:27 milieu, the cultic access interpretation would seem the more persuasive. On Hebrews' use of προσέρχομαι generally, see Scholer, *Proleptic*, 91-149.

<sup>268</sup> Hughes, *Commentary*, 543 proposes that Exod 19:12 is in mind, but the latter is the source only for Heb 12:20, emphatically warning against touching the mountain. Hebrews 12:18, however, makes a different point, namely the tangibility of Mount Sinai.

<sup>269</sup> BDF §65(3): the passive participle assumes the function of adjectives ending –τος.

- a) '....to a (mountain) that is touchable and (mountain) blazing with fire'<sup>270</sup>
- b) '....to a (mountain) that is touchable, and to a blazing fire.'<sup>271</sup>
- c) '....to a (mountain) that is touchable, a blazing fire.'<sup>272</sup>
- d) '....to a (mountain) that is touchable and blazing, to a fire.'<sup>273</sup>
- e) '....to a touchable, blazing fire'<sup>274</sup>

Bearing in mind the pericope's borrowing of Horeb imagery, it seems appropriate to preserve the association of *κεκαυμένω* with *πυρὶ* (cf. *ἐκαίετο πυρὶ*, 4:11), and not separate them as in option d).<sup>275</sup> *Καί* appears to be used in 12:18-19 as a delimiter between the respective terms; c) effectively omits *καί* and makes its presence unnecessarily redundant. E) could be accused of similar redundancy, though the difference in English between 'touchable, blazing fire' and 'touchable and blazing fire' is negligible. A more persuasive objection is the implicit, though direct, parallelism with *Σιὼν ὅρει* (12:22), which is not maintained if *πυρὶ* becomes the primary object of *προσεληλύθατε*; although *ὅρει* is lacking in 12:18, it is the audience's approach to two mountains – not fires – that forms the fundamental rhetorical comparison. Similarly, e) interrupts the 1-2-3 word structure of 12:18 (*ψηλαφωμένω* – *κεκαυμένω πυρὶ* – *γνόφω ζόφω θυέλλῃ*), with each mini-clause increasing by one word as it unfolds, a significant contribution to what appears to be an artistically crafted passage.<sup>276</sup> The D Y variants which place *ὅρει* after *ψηλαφωμένω* might demand that *ψηλαφωμένω* and *κεκαυμένω* be classed separately as in b), but a) still makes best sense of the evidence. All other NT

<sup>270</sup> NIV; KJV; ASV; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 352; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 226-28; Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 389.

<sup>271</sup> NASB; Attridge, *Epistle*, 372-73; Michel, *Brief*, 459-61; Koester, *Hebrews*, 542-43; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 326-27; Casey, "Eschatology", 308-19.

<sup>272</sup> This varies from b) in taking *κεκαυμένω πυρὶ* epexegetically, rather than as a separate motif in the list. So NRSV; NCV; ESV; Hughes, *Commentary*, 542-43.

<sup>273</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 672; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 464-65.

<sup>274</sup> NEB; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 181; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 410-11.

<sup>275</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 464n48 argues for d), since it groups respectively the participles and nouns of 12:18. We suggest that option a) also offers this option, but locates *πυρὶ* with its natural parent.

<sup>276</sup> That is not to mention the apparent oddity of a blazing fire that could be touched.

instances of καίω with πῦρ in the dative are rendered 'burn with fire' and not 'fire burning' (cf. Matt 13:40; Rev 8:8, 21:8)<sup>277</sup> – i.e. πυρὶ functions adverbially as a dative of instrument, and is not the subject modified by κεκαυμένω. This is, of course, commensurate with its Deuteronomic source, namely the *mountain burns with fire* (cf. τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρὶ – Deut 4:11).<sup>278</sup>

The case for the γνόφω καὶ ζόφω καὶ θυέλλῃ triumvirate originating from Exod 10:22 is stronger in the light of the possible source of ψηλαφωμένω in Exod 10:21, but bearing in mind the context of Heb 12:18, Deut 4:11/5:22 are the more likely origin, since they specifically apply the phrase to the Horeb theophany. All three moot sources read σκότος γνόφος θυέλλα; the shift in Heb 12:18 from σκότος to the synonymous ζόφος may be for rhetorical "euphony,"<sup>279</sup> or, as ζόφος occurs in Symmachus, it may have formed part of Hebrews' *Vorlage*.<sup>280</sup> The maintenance of the triumvirate, albeit with καὶ inserted for growing rhetorical effect, also preserves the rather unusual build up of successive nouns produced by Deuteronomy in its description of Sinai.<sup>281</sup>

The sounding of the trumpet (Heb 12:19) is found in Exodus (Exod 19:19, 20:18) rather than Deuteronomy, as is the cited warning regarding animals touching

---

<sup>277</sup> Similarly so in the LXX, where καίω followed by πῦρ in the dative always has the sense of 'burning with fire' (Exod 3:2; Deut 4:11, 5:23, 9:11). Πῦρ is never the subject of καίω when it follows the verb.

<sup>278</sup> At the risk of circular reasoning, the very fact that the option a) reflects the Deuteronomic source makes the case for it persuasive. Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 228, justifies the a) reading primarily on the evidence of the Deut 4:11 original. Casey, "Eschatology", 319 claims such a translation is "unnecessary," since "the author is simply listing the several external characteristics of the OT theophany." This view seems overly simplistic, partly because of what seems a well-crafted deliberate structure of Heb 12:18-19, partly because the writer seems particular as to what is in/excluded in the portrayal. (Casey herself seems to recognize this; cf. 318, where she concedes that Hebrews also omits significant elements of the OT accounts).

<sup>279</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 461.

<sup>280</sup> Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 221. The word occurs in Exod 10:22 – neither Deut 4:11 nor 5:22 are extant; cf. Alison Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (JSS Monograph 15; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1991), 247. Several Hebrews MSS (P<sup>46</sup>, Ψ) read σκότει, accommodating to the 'Byzantine Septuagintism' σκότω (cf. Deut 4:11, 5:22) and further evidence of Deuteronomic borrowing – see Zuntz, *Text*, 174.

<sup>281</sup> O. Betz, "Φωνή," *TDNT* 9:278-309 separates the threesome, splitting 12:18b into two visible pairs: 'fire and thick cloud' and 'darkness and stormy wind'. Not only does this disassociate πυρὶ from κεκαυμένω, more significantly it breaks up the threefold poetry that Hebrews seems keen to replicate.

the mountain (Heb 12:20; cf. Exod 19:12-13). However, the φωνῇ ῥημάτων (Heb 12:19) is exclusive, in terms at least of Sinai, to Deut 4:12, and is the climactic point of the seven-fold description of the theophany.<sup>282</sup> The φωνῇ ῥημάτων declares the covenant (διαθήκη) to Israel (Deut 4:13; cf. Heb 12:24), a factor not explicitly outlined in the Exodus account, but one fundamental to the overall covenantal comparison in 12:18-24. Moreover, the response to the voice, that the ones who heard it begged that no further word be spoken to them (Heb 12:19), is arguably much closer to the Deuteronomic recounting of events than that in Exodus. In the former, Israel is described as 'hearing' (ἀκούω – Deut 5:23, 5:25; cf. Heb 12:19) the voice (φωνήν, Deut 5:23; cf. Heb 12:19) from the fire (Deut 5:23-24);<sup>283</sup> they cannot bear to continue (προστίθῃμι, Deut 5:25; cf. Heb 12:19) listening to the word coming forth, fearing that the fire will consume them (Deut 5:25; cf. Heb 12:29).<sup>284</sup> The leaders' plea to Moses that he act in their place (5:27) is far closer to the 'begging' of Heb 12:19 than the more muted request of Exod 20:18-19.<sup>285</sup>

Coupled with the quotation of Deut 9:19 in 12:21, Heb 12:18-19 depends heavily upon Deuteronomic material for painting the awesomeness of the Sinai theophany. We will have further cause to examine Hebrews' (re-)use of Sinai, but for the present, it suffices to note that Hebrews' account in 12:18-21 is indebted lexically to the picture drawn by the Deuteronomist.

### **3.3 Deuteronomic Echoes in Hebrews**

#### **3.3.1 Deut 32:46, 4:9/Heb 2:1**

---

<sup>282</sup> Betz, *TDNT* 9:297.

<sup>283</sup> Deut 5:23 MT has YHWH speaking from the midst of the darkness (ⲓⲱⲛ); the LXX reiterates its origin within the fire (ⲡⲓⲣ) perhaps to bring 5:23 into line with 5:22 and 5:24.

<sup>284</sup> See 3.1.5.

<sup>285</sup> Taken with the infinitive προστεθῆναι, παραιτέομαι is understood as a request, in this case an impassioned one, and not a direct refusal of YHWH (BDAG s.v 1b; BDF §429. Μῆ is *de facto* redundant). In 12:25, παραιτέομαι has its more customary sense of rejection. This dual-faceted, rather than synonymous, reading of παραιτέομαι sustains the broader Deuteronomic context to 12:18-29, since the Sinai generation find the divine voice *both* unbearable (Deut 5:23-27; Heb 12:19) *and* something to be rejected (Deut 8:20, 9:23; Heb 12:25).

Deut 4:9 LXX	Deut 32:46 LXX	Heb 2:1
<p><b>πρόσεχε</b> σεαυτῷ καὶ  φύλαξον τὴν ψυχὴν σου  σφόδρα μὴ ἐπιλάβῃ πάντας  τοὺς λόγους</p>	<p><b>προσέχετε</b> τῇ καρδίᾳ  ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς  λόγους τούτους</p>	<p>Διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ  περισσότερως  <b>προσέχειν</b> ἡμᾶς  τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν</p>

The lexical basis for the Deuteronomic echo in Heb 2:1 is marginal, but the thematic and contextual basis for the allusion somewhat stronger.<sup>286</sup> The primary verbal correspondence is the shared hortatory προσέχω, but this is a relatively common LXX verb, and, of itself, insufficient foundation for any formal echo. More persuasive evidence comes from the various contextual affiliations between the two texts. Deuteronomy 32 was quoted in Heb 1:6 (32:43) and will also be alluded to in 2:5 (32:8), so is plausibly on the author's horizons at this stage. The immediate context of 2:1, and the causative principle behind διὰ τοῦτο, is the salvation that the audience are about to inherit (κληρονομεῖν, 1:14). Inheritance is a common term for the goal of believers in the epistle (6:12, 6:17, 9:15, 11:7-8), but it is also the context that Moses gives to the gift of the land – they will 'inherit' it (κληρονομέω, Deut 32:47). In both texts, the grounds for paying attention is inherently linked to their inheritance, an inheritance that both parties are about to receive (1:14 – μέλλω; 32:47 – the imminent sense of the present διαβαίνετε).

When used intransitively, as in Heb 2:1 and Deut 32:46, προσέχω is customarily understood as 'listen to'.<sup>287</sup> Where Hebrews' audience are to hold on to what they have heard (τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν – 2:1),<sup>288</sup> Moses similarly exhorts Israel to listen to and heed the words (οὓς λόγους τούτους, 32:46) that have been delivered in their hearing (εἰς τὰ ὦτα τοῦ λαοῦ – 32:44). Both texts claim adherence to an aural message (cf. Heb 1:1-2), one that is spoken by, or originates from, God himself. The Song, although delivered by human agency, is ascribed divine provenance (Deut 31:19), an interpretation likely endorsed by Hebrews in 1:6 (YHWH is the implicit subject of λέγει). The τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν are given similar divine origin. As the term

<sup>286</sup> Both Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 136 and Koester, *Hebrews*, 205 suggest a Deuteronomic echo in 2:1.

<sup>287</sup> MHT 3.6§2 (52). Cf. 2 Pet 1:19, Acts 8:6.

<sup>288</sup> The use of παρακοή in relation to disobedience (2:2) is thus apposite; such disobedience is a failure to listen – παρακοή.

is neuter, the phrase probably refers to the gospel message, but, in the context of 1:14 and 2:3-4, a primary aspect of the message is the σωτηρία that the audience are about to inherit. This σωτηρία is spoken by the LORD (2:3) and attested by God in visual form (2:4); human agency is reduced to a secondary or confirmatory role. The theme of witness is also shared: God bears witness to the new reality (συνεπιμαρτυρέω – Heb 2:4), just as the song he gave Moses was to serve as a witness against Israel (μαρτύριον – Deut 31:19), and just as Moses bore witness to them (διαμαρτύρομαι – Deut 32:46). This shared notion of witness may explain the use of διαμαρτύρομαι in Heb 2:6, mooted as a possible allusion to Deut 32:46 by Ellingworth.<sup>289</sup>

The respective texts show some similarity in respect of the consequences of failing to adhere to their teaching. The *a fortiori* comparison of Heb 2:2-3 outlines the serious implications of disregarding the new covenant obligations, such implications being correspondingly worse than those of the Sinai dispensation. Deuteronomy 32:46-47 itself does not explicate the penalty of failing to attend to the word, but its contextual overtones are strongly negative and the subsequent sober reminder of Moses' failure to enter into the land (32:48-52) testifies to the harsh consequence of disobedience to YHWH's word. More significantly, both texts articulate an exemplary comparison with *past* disobedience. For the Moab assembly, their forefathers' apostasy of Deut 32:15-25 is held out as paradigmatic and heuristic (cf. 32:2), and serves as the (negative) basis for present action (32:46-47). For Hebrews' audience, the comparative sense of περισσοτέρως<sup>290</sup> suggests that this 'new' generation pay greater attention to YHWH's word than they themselves have paid hitherto; in view of 2:2, it is greater attention also than that of the Israelite forefathers post-Sinai. Hebrews 2:1-2 thus both mimics the Song and also anticipates Heb 3:7-19 (especially 3:7, 3:15), where the wilderness generation's failure to listen to YHWH's voice and their consequent failure to enter into YHWH's rest demonstrates further paradigmatic use of their forefathers' disobedience (4:2).

If there is much contextual evidence to bind Heb 2:1 with Deut 32:46-47, an equally plausible case may be made for Deut 4:9.<sup>291</sup> It may emphasize things seen

---

<sup>289</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 147.

<sup>290</sup> Cf. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 135; BDAG. A comparative sense to περισσοτέρως is not ubiquitous, but the context of 2:1-2 suggests that it is present here (cf. Gal. 1:14, possibly Phil 1:14).

<sup>291</sup> Cf. Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 51; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.25.

rather than heard, and the object of προσέχω is 'yourself' (σεαυτῶ) rather than the words delivered, but this is not overly detrimental; Hebrews' own appeal is still to personal experience (2:3) and the divine attestation of τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν is presumably as much visual as auditory (cf. 2:4).<sup>292</sup> Moreover, the Sinai/Horeb context of Deut 4 is clearly on Hebrews' radar since Deut 4:11-12 is used subsequently in the letter (Heb 12:18-19), and here YHWH *spoke* from the fire (4:12: cf. Heb 12:19) delivering the covenant to Israel.<sup>293</sup> The Horeb context is also germane to the contrast of Heb 2:2-3, since the mediatory angelic presence at the giving of the Sinaitic law forms the lesser part of the comparison (2:2).<sup>294</sup>

In both Deut 4:9 and Heb 2:1, Sinai is seen as a past entity; appeal is made to a past Horeb reality as the grounds for obedience in the present.<sup>295</sup> In Heb 2:1-3, the penalties for old covenant (specifically Sinai) disobedience are the starting point for warning of the consequences of ignoring the new Christ-initiated salvation (cf. Heb 10:28-29; 12:25). Deuteronomy 4:9-10 ascribes Sinai a similar didactic purpose; the audience are to remind their descendants of the Horeb moment because of its determining status for Israel's identity, existence and conduct. It is still a *past* experience – one to which that generation would not actually have been privy (Deut 2:16) – whose significance is transposed to the present identity of the Moab assembly. This, of course, is equally true for 32:47: in the Song, Israel's recent history is presented heuristically as a past experience, one distinct from the new order being enacted 'today' (σήμερον, 32:46), but which retains exemplary value for Israel's obedience. Whilst there is undoubted continuity with Horeb, it is *these* words (32:46) – those of Moab – that are life giving (ζωὴ ὑμῶν, 32:47), not those received on Sinai. Likewise, it is the new word revealed by the Lord (Heb 2:2), and not its precursor, which is to be ignored at the audience's peril.

---

<sup>292</sup> Hebrews 2:8-9 addresses the theme of 'seeing,' so perhaps lessening the distinction between auditory and visual experience.

<sup>293</sup> The testimony of σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν (Heb 2:4) may also recall Israel's exodus and wilderness experiences – see K. H. Regenstorff, "Σημεῖον," *TDNT* 7:200-261.

<sup>294</sup> The attestation of this tradition in Deut 33:2 – probably the source of the allusion in Heb 2:2 – would also add credibility to the claims of Deut 32:46-47, bearing in mind their proximity in LXX Deuteronomy. See 3.4.1.

<sup>295</sup> Cf. McConville and Millar, *Time*, 16-49.



### 3.3.2 Deut 32:47/Heb 4:12

Deut 32:47 MT	Deut 32:47 LXX	Heb 4:12
כִּי לֹא דִבֶּר רַק הוּא מִכֶּם כִּי הוּא חַיִּיכֶם	ὅτι οὐχὶ λόγος κενὸς οὗτος ὑμῖν ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν	Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ

In his commentary on Heb 4:12, Michel confidently asserts: "Was gemeint ist, sagt Dt 32:47 deutlich."<sup>296</sup> Michel does not unpack his comment further, but one assumes that he correlates the imposing warning of Heb 4:12<sup>297</sup> with the pressing exhortation of Deut 32:47, and, in particular, their common notion that the word of God in some fashion 'brings life.' Λόγος is the primary theme of both individual verses and their immediate context. In Heb 4:12-13, it functions as a quasi-inclusio, demarking the two verses as a distinct clause,<sup>298</sup> in Deut 32:47, it is given twofold description and ascribed causal primacy (ἐνεκεν τοῦ λόγου τούτου) for Israel's life and longevity in the land. Although patristic and medieval exegesis tended to view 4:12 christologically,<sup>299</sup> the warrant for this interpretation is extremely limited. Whilst there is ample evidence for a λόγος christology in Hebrews,<sup>300</sup> 4:12 does not

<sup>296</sup> Michel, *Brief*, 200. The verses' thematic association is also noted by Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.88; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 261; Hurst, *Background*, 101.

<sup>297</sup> Gene R. Smillie, "'O Logos Tou Theou' in Hebrews 4:12-13," *NovT* 46 (2004): 338-59 ascribes a curative, rather than judgmental, context to 4:12-13, with the sword performing a "heart operation" on the unbelieving heart. Whilst we want to stress the life giving properties of the warning, its connections with 2:1-4 and the threatening overtones of 4:13 require that 4:12-13 still be viewed as a warning of prospective judgment.

<sup>298</sup> Vanhoye, *Structure*, 102. Guthrie, *Structure*, 76-89 does not include 4:12-13 in his list of Hebrews' inclusios, but concurs that λόγος is the focal point of the verse (68).

<sup>299</sup> Cf. H. Clavier, "Ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ dans L'Épître aux Hébreux," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893-1958* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 81-93. For a defence of the christological view, see James Swetnam, "Jesus as Logos in Heb 4:12-13," *Bib* 62 (1981): 214-24.

<sup>300</sup> Ronald Williamson, "The Incarnation of the Logos in Hebrews," *ExpTim* 95 (1983): 4-8. Though note Hughes, *Hermeneutics*, 5, who observes both that the λόγος doctrine is "quite unrelated" to Hebrews' high-priestly discourse and that 'Word of God', when mentioned, "bears no obviously Christological significance."

contribute to it; λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is a subjective genitive<sup>301</sup> and encompasses God's verbal communication to Israel, specifically here Ps 95:7-11.<sup>302</sup>

Hebrews 4:12 describes the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as ζῶν ('living'), and, grammatically speaking at least, this varies from the nominal form of Deut 32:47 (ζωὴ ὑμῶν -'your life'). Attridge differentiates between the two forms, casting the LXX text as a proto-Johannine 'metaphysical' statement (cf. John 6:68), whilst depicting 4:12 as using ζάω to stress the 'relevancy' and vibrancy of the word of God (i.e. God still speaks through an old text to the new generation). Instead of Deut 32:47, he parallels Heb 4:12's usage of ζάω/λόγος with that in Acts 7:38 (λόγια ζώντα),<sup>303</sup> whose participle form of ζάω matches that of 4:12. One would certainly want to affirm the continuing 'living' nature of the text, but at the same time, Attridge's differentiation may underestimate the way in which Heb 4:12 emphasizes the functional or performative<sup>304</sup> aspect of ζάω.<sup>305</sup> The further description of the word as ἐνεργῆς implies some functional or causative dimension to it, beyond any ontological claim being made.<sup>306</sup> But more significantly, γὰρ (4:12) links the statement about the word of God with the fate of the wilderness generation who 'fell' (πίπτω; cf. 3:17) in the desert through disobedience. In context, πίπτω is synonymous with death,<sup>307</sup> and 4:12 thus constructs an antithesis between the disobedience that engendered death, and the word of God that brings life – i.e. that is *life giving*, that is 'life'.<sup>308</sup> Hebrews' audience must choose between the way of the wilderness (death) and the way of the divine rest (life). *Pace* Attridge, the λόγος is

---

<sup>301</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 260.

<sup>302</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 103; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 87. On the phrase's ambiguity, see Johnson, *Hebrews*, 131-33.

<sup>303</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 134. One notes that the λόγια ζώντα (Acts 7:38) pertain to the giving of the law on Sinai. Although the context is Horeb rather than Moab, it is not entirely divorced from the law/word to which Moses demands obedience in Deut 32:46-47. Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.88 equates Acts 7:38 and Deut 32:47 when seeking to explicate the meaning of 'living' in 4:12.

<sup>304</sup> We understand 'performative' in its speech-act context, i.e. as "*doing* something rather than merely *saying* something" – cf. J. L. Austin, J. O. Urmson, and G. J. Warnock, *Philosophical Papers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 235.

<sup>305</sup> Cf. G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980), 22.

<sup>306</sup> Cf. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 102 – "having in itself energies of action."

<sup>307</sup> Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981), 661.

<sup>308</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.88: "Étant vie, elle apporte la vie avec elle." Hering, *L'Épître*, 46 also describes the word as the "source de vie." BDAG: that which "offers life."

relevant precisely *because* it brings life; its vitality and function are inextricably intertwined.<sup>309</sup> The God who is living (Heb 3:12; 9:14; 10:31; 12:22) speaks a word that brings life.<sup>310</sup>

If there were concerns about such lexical or thematic correspondence, more persuasive is the argument from context. The heart is important to both texts as the locus of obedience/disobedience: the λόγος is both to be guarded in the heart (Deut 32:46) and the means by which the heart's inner thoughts are uncovered (4:12). Trompf concludes that, in 4:12-13, "the writer is seeking above all to warn, to discourage ἀπειθεία, and to increase men's dread of falling into the hands of an omnipotent God who has scrutinized every part of their lives."<sup>311</sup> Such language is reminiscent of Heb 10:30-31 (especially 10:31, φοβερὸν . . . ζῶντος), which itself is similarly founded upon Deut 32 (32:35-36; cf. also Heb 12:29/Deut 4:24). Bearing in mind the familiarity with the Song we are observing on Hebrews' part (1:6, 2:1, 3:12, 10:30), it would seem entirely characteristic for him to once again deploy its paraenetic content, particularly when the context is ostensibly that of Israel's history. Moreover, Heb 2:1-4 and 4:12-13 share a common urgent hortatory tone, and it would be unsurprising if both texts alluded to the similarly pivotal tenor of Deut 32:46-47.<sup>312</sup>

Whilst 4:12 may resonate lexically with LXX Ps 118:25, and thematically with Wis 18:15-16 and Isa 55:11,<sup>313</sup> Deut 32:47's affinity is more impressive. Its context is analogous to the post-wilderness, Canaan entry backdrop that has formed the basis for Heb 3:7-4:11.<sup>314</sup> Hebrews 4:11 exhorts the audience to strive to enter into the rest; obedience to the word of God is the grounds by which this is achieved (3:15-16; 4:2; 4:11-12).<sup>315</sup> The warning of 4:12 is a complementary, final admonition to learn from the mistakes of the wilderness generation, whose rejection of God's

---

<sup>309</sup> Cf. 1 Pet 1:23 – the word of God is living (relevant/active) because it produces imperishable seed (i.e. it brings life).

<sup>310</sup> Contra Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 84.

<sup>311</sup> Garry W. Trompf, "Conception of God in Hebrews 4:12-13," *ST* 25, no. 2 (1971): 127.

<sup>312</sup> Guthrie, *Structure*, 81n13 suggests that 2:1-4 and 4:12-13 are parallel passages.

<sup>313</sup> Isaiah 55:11 has broad thematic correlation with Heb 4:12, but lacks significant lexical or contextual affiliation. It has no reference to ζῶν, whose position at the start of 4:12 gives it some interpretative significance.

<sup>314</sup> Hurst, *Background*, 101.

<sup>315</sup> Cf. 4:2, where hearing and faithfulness are similarly requisite.

word occasioned their failure to enter into the land/rest.<sup>316</sup> Deuteronomy 32:47 follows this same trajectory: the exhortation is to cross over the Jordan and enter the land, the goal of their pilgrimage journey. The Moab assembly are addressed post-wilderness rebellion (Deut 1:19-46) and exhorted not to rebel against the word of the Lord (Deut 1:43; cf. 32:15-18). This word is their life (32:47) and will bring them life in the land. The poignant implications of ignoring it follow on in the subsequent verses (32:48-52); Moses' death and failure to enter Canaan paradigmatically illustrate how prior disobedience denies access to the promised inheritance.

### **3.3.3 Deut 32:4/Heb 10:23**

<b>Deut 32:4 LXX</b>	<b>Deut 7:9 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 10:23</b>
θεὸς πιστός καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία	κύριος ὁ θεός σου οὗτος θεός θεὸς πιστός	πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος

Perhaps because of its quasi-axiomatic tone, the almost throwaway assertion at the end of Heb 10:23 invariably disappears off the exegetical horizon. The familiar NT notion of God<sup>317</sup> as πιστός<sup>318</sup> could render the clause essentially generic or, especially in the context of ὁμολογίαν (10:23), merely a familiar aspect of the NT church's confession, with no other meaning implied. Yet bearing in mind the thematic importance of both πίστις and ἐπαγγέλλομαι in the whole letter, it would be unwise to dismiss the section prematurely. The reference to divine faithfulness may be shown to be a further echo of the Song of Moses (32:4), addressing once more its theme of YHWH's faithfulness.

---

<sup>316</sup> Otfried Hofius, *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom Endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief* (WUNT 11; Tübingen: Mohr, 1970), 138-39 argues persuasively that 4:11-13 is an exhortation premised upon the negative example of the wilderness disobedience.

<sup>317</sup> Whilst Jesus is elsewhere described as πιστός (2:17, 3:2) the context of 10:23, especially in relation to 11:11 and 6:13-20, demands that God himself is ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος.

<sup>318</sup> First Corinthians 1:9; 1 Cor 10:13; 2 Cor 1:18; 1 Thess 5:24; 2 Thess 3:3; 2 Tim 2:13; 1 Pet 4:19; 1 John 1:9.

In parallel to the desired steadfastness (ἀκλινής)<sup>319</sup> of the audience's confession (10:23a), 10:23b underscores the characteristic faithfulness of God. Revisiting the promissory imagery of 6:13-18, he is described as the one who promised, but, as the predicate adjective precedes the nominal phrase, ὁ ἐπαγγελλόμενος is secondary to πιστὸς in the flow of the exhortation. Faithfulness, instead, is primary. Whereas the attribution of πιστὸς to God is common in the NT, it is a comparatively rare occurrence in the LXX.<sup>320</sup> In broad relation to God, πιστὸς is found only in Deut 7:9, Deut 32:4, 3 Macc 2:11, Sol 14:1, Sol 17:10; Isa 49:7, Jer 49:5 and Pss 111:7, 144:13a LXX. Aside, however, from the two Deuteronomic texts, the referent noun is κύριος or βασιλεύς rather than θεός as found in Heb 10:23;<sup>321</sup> for a precise ascription of God (θεός) as 'faithful' (πιστὸς), Deut 7:9 and Deut 32:4 are the principal biblical sources. If a scriptural echo is being made in Heb 10:23, then these two verses are the primary candidates.<sup>322</sup>

As to which of the texts is the source, either is possible. Deut 7:9 presents God's faithfulness in terms of covenantal loyalty and the oath made to Israel's forefathers (Deut 7:8-9). Hebrews conceptualizes the ancestral oath as the ἐπαγγελία (6:13, 11:9, 11:11),<sup>323</sup> and Deut 7:9's sentiments thus accord with the depiction of God's faithfulness to the Abrahamic promise (Heb 6:17-18), and the δύο πραγμάτων (the 'promise' coupled with the 'oath') that testify to the unchanging nature of a God who cannot lie (6:18). Deuteronomy 7:9 also pairs πιστὸς with ἔλεος, the two themes declared in 2:17 (ἐλεήμων ... καὶ πιστὸς) and respectively developed in 3:1-4:11 and 4:14-5:10, albeit in relation to Christ's high priesthood.

Deuteronomy 32:4, however, is the more likely source. The Song is alluded to in 10:25 (Deut 32:35b – see 3.3.4), so is on the author's horizons in 10:19-25, but more significantly, both 10:23 and Deut 32:4 present God's faithfulness as an *a priori*

---

<sup>319</sup> Grammatically speaking, ἀκλινῇ is an adjective modifying ὁμολογίαν, but most translations render it adverbially (NASB, NIV, NRSV, KJV); cf. F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 256: "if the confession wavers it is because the confessors waver."

<sup>320</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 163.

<sup>321</sup> Direct quotations aside, Hebrews generally renders God (i.e. YHWH) with θεός rather than κύριος, the latter title having christological reference. The restriction for the source of an echo therefore to θεός ensures that an option has both lexical *and* thematic resonance, not just thematic.

<sup>322</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 211n30 proposes a similar echo of Deut 32:4 in 1 Cor 10:13, an interesting possibility bearing in mind how both 1 Cor 10:1-13 and Hebrews passim use the wilderness exemplar.

<sup>323</sup> Lehne, *New*, 19-22.

characteristic, without needing to explicate any grounds for their assertion. We have already witnessed Hebrews' engagement with the Song's divine πίστις/Israelite ἀπιστία tension in 3:1-19,<sup>324</sup> and 10:23 probably represents a restatement of this theme, re-articulating the Deut 32 comparison between God's faithfulness and that of his people. In the epistle, the appeal to God's faithfulness (10:23) parallels the exhortation to assurance of faith (πληροφορία πίστεως, 10:22); in the Song, the absence of Israelite faithfulness is a source of contention (Deut 32:20) and is directly contrasted with God's characteristic faithfulness (32:4). By alluding to the Song, Heb 10:23 affirms the faithfulness of God (cf. 3:1-6), but also revisits the paradigmatic unfaithfulness and apostasy of the wilderness generation explored in 3:7-19. The statement of divine faithfulness reminds the audience of the Song's corollary depiction of a people who were not ἀκλινής, who did waver in their confession and who forfeited the promise of Canaan (4:1).<sup>325</sup>

### **3.3.4 Deut 32:35b/Heb 10:25**

<b>Deut 32:35b LXX</b>	<b>Heb 10:25</b>
ὅτι ἐγγύς ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν	ὅσω βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν

The concept of an eschatological Day of the Lord (DL) is frequently invoked in the LXX, predominantly in the prophetic literature, and often in relationship with ἐγγύς/ἐγγίζω (Joel 1:15, 2:1 4:14; Zeph 1:7, 1:14; Obad 1:15; Isa 13:6; Ezek 30:3). The abbreviated or unqualified form – 'the Day' (cf. Heb 10:25) – is also found in the LXX in relation to ἐγγίζω, but to a far lesser degree, Ezek 7:4 LXX being the only relevant example.<sup>326</sup> Deuteronomy 32:35b falls into a third category, where the context is still the divine judgment of the DL and the modifier is 'near', but the phrase 'day of calamity' is the subject of the verb. It is these latter two exceptions that

<sup>324</sup> See 3.2.1.

<sup>325</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.318 is sympathetic to the wilderness backdrop of 10:23. Similarly, deSilva, *Perseverance*, 341: "The author's use of the negative example of the wilderness generation, which distrusted God's promise, wavered in its confession of hope, and fell short of God's gift, has already prepared the hearers not to make such a poor choice."

<sup>326</sup> Ezek. 22:4 reads ἡγγισσας τὰς ἡμέρας σου, but the verse lacks any eschatological context.

concern us, for they depart from the customary portrayal of the DL in its most common, extended form in relation to ἐγγύς/ἐγγίζω.

The familiarity of the DL extends to the NT writers (Acts 2:20, 1 Cor 1:8, 1 Thess 5:2, 2 Cor 1:14, 2 Thess 2:2); it is alternatively described as the 'Day of God' (2 Pet 3:12, Rev 16:14) or, as in Heb 10:25, simply as 'the Day' (1 Thess 5:5, 1 Cor 3:13).<sup>327</sup> However, the association of 'Day' with 'near' is less common in the NT, appearing only in Heb 10:25 and Rom 13:12. Although the judgment milieu of 10:26-31 implies that the Day of the Lord is clearly the referent,<sup>328</sup> one must take account of 10:25's usage of the shorter form (i.e. solely 'day'). Whilst it may be counted as literary simplicity or lexical brevity, it may also represent a further allusion to the Song of Moses (Deut 32:35b), the very portion that provides textual reinforcement of YHWH's impending judgment in 10:30.<sup>329</sup>

Its abbreviated form – 'the Day' – in conjunction with ἐγγύς, may point to Ezek 7:4 for the source of an echo, for that text uniquely juxtaposes ἐγγύς with ἡμέρα. Such comparative rareness might be persuasive but for Hebrews' broad disinterest in Ezekiel's prophecy.<sup>330</sup> Deuteronomy 32:35b has a far more pressing claim, most persuasively its situation between the two phrases quoted in 10:30a and 10:30b (Deut 32:35a and 32:36 respectively). If, as seems likely on the basis of the Song's repeated citation, Hebrews is familiar with the text of Deut 32, then it is conceivable that the phrase ἐγγύς ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας was also in his mind when composing this portion of the epistle. Ἀπώλεια (32:35b) denotes the fate of the unfaithful in Heb 10:39, and this latter usage probably derives from 32:35b, for the scope of 10:39 harks back to the judgment theme of 10:30-31.<sup>331</sup> The echo adds an

---

<sup>327</sup> The DL was a familiar motif within Jewish-Christian thought, as the anticipated end-time judgment of YHWH. Christian thinking extended its scope to include the parousia (cf. Heb 9:27-28), which, for Hebrews at least, would usher in the promised inheritance of salvation (1:14, 6:11). In view of its cessationist tabernacle/cult discourse, Hebrews' assessment of the DL may incorporate the fall of Jerusalem (so Gordon, *Hebrews*, 120-21), but 10:25-31 focus upon on the imminence of the parousia/judgment, without specifying its earthly manifestations.

<sup>328</sup> Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 233-34 and Lane, *Hebrews*, 277x explicitly translate ἡμέρα as such.

<sup>329</sup> Commentators rarely note the relationship between 10:25 and Deut 32:35b. Exceptions are Gleason, "Eschatology," 119; Löhr, *Umkehr*, 231.

<sup>330</sup> Longenecker, *Biblical*, 167: "with the exception of Isaiah, only minimal use is made of the prophetic books."

<sup>331</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 307 views the life/destruction antithesis of 10:39 as quasi-Deuteronomical (cf. Deut 30:15-20), echoing the blessing/curse motif of Heb 6:7-8, itself a covenantal allusion. See 4.2.1.

increased consistency to the move from exhortation (10:19-25) to warning (10:26-31) with Deut 32:35 being part of the glue that binds the two sections together.

### **3.3.5 Deut 20:3/Heb 12:3**

<b>Deut 20:3 LXX</b>	<b>Heb 12:3</b>
μὴ ἐκλυέσθω ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν μὴ φοβεῖσθε μηδὲ θραύεσθε	ἵνα μὴ κάμῃτε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι

The NA<sup>27</sup> marginal notes propose an association between Heb 12:3 and Deut 20:3.<sup>332</sup> Few commentaries – if any<sup>333</sup> – acknowledge this as an echo, as the relationship between the two texts is marginal even for the most ardent proponent of Hebrews-Deuteronomy intertextuality. The primary ground for any relationship is the shared ἐκλύω,<sup>334</sup> with both verses urging their listeners not to weaken in their imminent struggles (Heb 12:3-4; Deut 20:1-9). However, although an important verb in the pericope and a *Stichwort* between 12:1-3 and 12:4-11, ἐκλύω is common enough within the LXX and, taken by itself, an insufficient criterion to justify an echo. The argument might be more credible if one read ἀρχηγός (12:2) as 'captain' or 'leader', reciprocating the militaristic context of Deut 20:3, but this translation better befits 2:10, with 'pioneer' its more customary rendering in 12:2.

There is some limited contextual similarity; where YHWH (κύριος) went ahead of Israel (ὁ προπορευόμενος) to fight on their behalf (Deut 20:4), so Jesus is the forerunner (πρόδρομος, Heb 6: 20) of the NC community, who has already endured the cross (12:2) and rendered the Enemy powerless (2:14). Similarly, both texts address Israel at the moment of decision: just as the second generation were positioned at the culmination of their pilgrimage journey anticipating impending battle (Deut 20:1-4), so the audience of Hebrews await their imminent salvation (Heb

<sup>332</sup> The marginal notes articulate a variety of relationships, without necessitating a formal allusion or echo. However, the fact that the cross reference is made demands that the relationship at least be examined.

<sup>333</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.389 relates the two texts, but does not build an allusion from it.

<sup>334</sup> The textual debate between ἐκλυόμενοι and ἐκλελυόμενοι (12:3) is not decisive; commentators accept both variants. Since the completed sense of ἐκλελυόμενοι fits ill with Deut 20:3's anticipatory context, enthusiasm for the validity of the allusion must be tempered.



1:14), yet expect further suffering, perhaps even bloodshed (12:4).<sup>335</sup> The parallel exhortations in Deut 20:3 (μὴ φοβεῖσθε and μηδὲ θραύεσθε) possibly resonate with other warnings in the letter (respectively 11:27, 13:6; 10:23) and, if ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν modifies ἐκλυόμενοι rather than κάμητε,<sup>336</sup> then the correspondence between ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι (Heb 12:3) and μὴ ἐκλύεσθω ἡ καρδιά ὑμῶν (Deut 20:3) is somewhat closer.

The basis for the allusion remains, however, at best, tenuous. The legal corpus of Deut 12-26 has not so far provided significant source material for Hebrews (Heb 10:28 aside) and its inclusion at this point seems generally uninvited. Syntactically, ἐκλυόμενοι is only secondary to the main verb κάμητε (not found in Deuteronomy), and the prevailing imagery of 12:1-3 appears to be athletic rather than militaristic.<sup>337</sup> Instead, one might tentatively suggest that if any Deuteronomic – or rather 'wilderness' – referent is found in Heb 12:3, it comes from the imagery invited by ἀντιλογίαν. Ellingworth has proposed that the Korah rebellion and his band's self-inflicted destruction (Num 16-17) provide the primary LXX context for Heb 12:3.<sup>338</sup> In particular, ἀντιλογία evokes both the actual rebellion of Korah (cf. Jude 1:11, where it is used specifically of Korah) and secondarily the paradigmatic testing at Meribah (cf. Deut 32:51, 33:8; Num 20:13, 27:14). Whilst specific reference to Korah is probably special pleading (it demands significant lexical awareness on the audience's part and seems motivated by a desire to defend the textual integrity of ἑαυτοῦς), the evocation of Meribah is certainly plausible, since 12:3 precedes the wilderness παιδεία discourse of 12:5-11 with its associated context of divine testing. Taken in this sense, the reference to the hostility of sinners (12:3) harks the audience once more back to the wilderness generation, to warn them of the consequences of falling away; "the rejection of Christ, one might say, is Massah and Meribah ... all over again."<sup>339</sup>

---

<sup>335</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 358n80 observes that 12:3-4 could be understood in military terms, which would likewise befit Deut 20's context.

<sup>336</sup> Cited as more the probable case by Lane, *Hebrews*, 440.

<sup>337</sup> See especially Croy, *Endurance*, 173f.

<sup>338</sup> Paul Ellingworth, "New Testament Text and Old Testament Context in Heb. 12.3," in *Studia Biblica 1978* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; JSNTSupp 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 89-96; cf. also Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 216.

<sup>339</sup> Ellingworth, "New," 93.

### 3.3.6 Deut 29:18a/Heb 12:15a

Deut 29:18a LXX	Heb 12:15a
μή τις ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνὴ ἢ πατριὰ ἢ φυλὴ τίνος ἢ διάνοια ἐξέκλινεν ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν	ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ

In 3.2.4, we argued that Heb 12:15b makes a strong allusion to Deut 29:18b regarding the pernicious effects of an apostate individual upon the community. It is our contention that Heb 12:15's perspective actually incorporates the whole of Deut 29:18, and that a similar parallel exists between Deut 29:18a and Heb 12:15a.<sup>340</sup> The replication (and expansion) of the dual μή τις structure<sup>341</sup> is suggestive of an allusion, as is the shared appeal to community responsibility/oversight for the actions of the individual. DeSilva proposes that the triple parallelism of 12:15-17 and the absence of any conjunction between the respective phrases demand that all three speak to a single issue, namely apostasy.<sup>342</sup>

Key here is the semantic equivalence between ὑστερέω (12:15a) and ἐκκλίνω (Deut 29:18a), and specifically whether the former conveys the latter's contextual evocation of idolatry and apostasy. The two verbs are not necessarily synonymous; ὑστερέω is understood elsewhere as 'missing out' on the divine rest (Heb 4:1), and, if translated likewise in 12:15a, would equate to missing out on or falling short of the grace of God, i.e. not reaching it.<sup>343</sup> Alternatively, the verb may carry the sense of being excluded from something,<sup>344</sup> thus having a stative or

<sup>340</sup> Suggested as a possibility by Katz, "Quotations," 214; Casey, "Eschatology", 104n1; Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 304; Braun, *Hebräer*, 424; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 209; Marshall, *Kept*, 149. Katz extends the scope of the allusion to the Deut 29:19 – see 4.2.2.

<sup>341</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 214: "the first two μή τις clauses of Hebrews reflect the two found in Deuteronomy and the third is clearly fashioned to suit them."

<sup>342</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 459.

<sup>343</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 349: ὑστερέω = "fails to attain." Also Johnson, *Hebrews*, 324; Attridge, *Epistle*, 367-68; Thomas G. Long, *Hebrews* (Louisville: John Knox, 1997), 135.

<sup>344</sup> Michel, *Brief*, 453. Wilson, *Hebrews*, 227 suggests that the author had in mind the 'exclusion' of the wilderness generation from the land on account of their apostasy. The common use of ὑστερέω links 12:15a with 4:1's context, namely the goal of the promised κατάπαυσις. In the replaying of the

objective connotation: no individual is to be in a state of 'non-participation' in or 'non-reception' of the grace of God.<sup>345</sup> This second reading is preferable, but it does not necessitate a context of apostasy; it may merely indicate a spiritual lethargy, rather than a deliberate turning away from YHWH's purposes.<sup>346</sup> Nor need it follow that the agent or subject of ὑστερέω (here τὶς) actually *causes* or is even responsible for the action.

The apostate context of 12:15-17, however, suggests that the rendering of ὑστερέω be somewhat more nuanced. The presence of ἀπὸ (found likewise with ἐκκλίνω in Deut 29:18) implies that the audience have already been a prior participant or recipient of divine grace – i.e. they had previously 'arrived' and are warned against 'departing' *from* it.<sup>347</sup> Ὑστερέω is potentially a volitional action; the deed itself (the 'departing') is as important as its outcome (non-reception of the grace). Ellingworth/Nida are broadly sympathetic to this notion and view ὑστερέω as "turning back," thereby conveying the "idea of receiving God's grace and then letting it go rather than that of missing it altogether."<sup>348</sup> Similarly, Lane equates it with the act of 'drawing back' (cf. 10:39), symptomatic of rejection of the divine promise and effectively apostasy.<sup>349</sup> It is possible, therefore, that ὑστερέω conveys the idea of 'falling away,'<sup>350</sup> namely the deliberate renunciation of YHWH's purposes as conveyed by ἐκκλίνω. To 'turn away' from the grace of God (12:15) is to show contempt for and actively reject life under YHWH's (new) covenantal dispensation and community. The action is perhaps not as striking as the dramatic rebellion

---

Deuteronomic allusion, the lure of apostasy is no longer to idolatry (as in Deut 29:18), but to apostasy from the promise of entering into the land/rest.

<sup>345</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 452: "exclusion from some benefit through one's own fault." Also BDF §180-5.

<sup>346</sup> Though Lane, *Hebrews*, 452 still sees the action as conscious apostasy. Although 12:12-13 may reflect spiritual lassitude, the context of 12:15-17 is wilful apostasy, the primary sin to which the letter's warning passages are addressed. See McKnight, "Warning," 36-43; Charles Edwin Carlston, "Eschatology and Repentance in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 78 (1959): 299; Marshall, *Kept*, 149; Braun, *Hebräer*, 424.

<sup>347</sup> Cf. Sir 7:34, where ἀπὸ is similarly found with ὑστερέω; the sense here may be understood as wilful detachment, akin to the mindset of apostasy (cf. also Heb 3:12: ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ). Eccl 6:2 also has the ὑστερέω ἀπὸ construction, but the sense here is 'lacking', not apostasy/departure.

<sup>348</sup> Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 304.

<sup>349</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 452.

<sup>350</sup> Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 224; Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 180.

anticipated in Heb 10:29 – it may represent a more gradual drifting away (cf. 2:1) – but it remains nonetheless the attitude of an apostate member of the community.<sup>351</sup>

### **3.4 Deuteronomic Narrative Allusions in Hebrews**

#### **3.4.1 Deut 33:2/Heb 2:2**

The *qal wahomer* argument of Heb 2:2-4 is predicated upon an appeal to ὁ δὲ ἁγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος as the 'lesser' part of the comparison made. The basis of the contrast is the provenance of the respective covenantal dispensations (cf. 10:28-29; 12:25),<sup>352</sup> Hebrews' premise being that angels were in some fashion party to the giving of the (former) Sinai covenant.<sup>353</sup> Although absent from the biblical recounting of the Sinai narrative (Exod 19-20; Deut 4-5), angelic mediation at Sinai appears to have become a prominent conception within later Jewish thought, with both pseudepigraphical and NT texts articulating their presence at the Sinai moment (*Jub.* 1:27, Acts 7:38, Gal 3:19).<sup>354</sup> The basis for this transition is beyond our scope,

---

<sup>351</sup> Hebrews' depiction of divine grace elsewhere suggests it can be presently experienced (and consequently lost) – cf. 4:16, 13:9.

<sup>352</sup> Thus we find Isaacs' apparent desire to downplay the use of the old covenant in the service of paraenesis somewhat misplaced. She contends that "only at 12:18-24 is the Sinai theme overtly used in exhortation" (*Sacred*, 118), a view that overlooks Sinai references such as 2:2, 10:28 and 12:29.

<sup>353</sup> Scholars have sporadically proposed that Hebrews' focus upon angels (1:5-2:5) is premised upon angel worship within its readership, or some form of veneration of Christ as an 'angel.' (A. Bakker, "Christ an Angel? A Study of Early Christian Docetism," *ZNW* 32 (1933): 255-65; Charles, "Angels," 171-78; Michael Goulder, "Hebrews and the Ebionites," *NTS* 49 (2003): 396 argues that "they hold some form of ... 'angel Christology'"). If this were so, however, the affirmation of angels in 13:2 would be somewhat odd; if angelic mediation is indeed part of the Sinai tradition, then it is more probable that the Son/angels *synkrisis* is based upon respective covenants mediators (Hurst, "Christology," 156; Schenck, "Celebration," 480; Meier, "Symmetry," 522). Where angels spoke the first covenant (2:2), so the Lord spoke the new one (2:3); the letter's subsequent comparisons with Moses, the tabernacle, and the Aaronite priesthood all bear the mark of this *synkrisis*. Even if the catena of 1:5-14 was borrowed from a separate context addressing an angelomorphic christological debate (so Albl, *Scripture*, 201-07), Hebrews' deploys it to attest the mediatory capacity of the angels at Sinai compared with that of the Son at Zion (cf. 12:22-24). See Son, *Zion*, 108-11.

<sup>354</sup> Lou H. Silberman, "Prophets/Angels: LXX and Qumran Psalm 151 and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Standing before God: Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and in Tradition with Essays in Honor of John M. Oesterreicher* (ed. Asher Finkel and Lawrence Frizzell; New York: Ktav, 1981), 91-101 disputes the tradition of angelic mediation at Sinai, instead seeing angels as synonymous with the prophets of Heb 1:1. Cf. also Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1987), 35-36. Precedent for the prophetic reading may exist in Josephus (*Ant.* 15.136 – see W. D. Davies, "A Note on Josephus, Antiquities 15.136," in *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (London: SPCK, 1984), 84-88), but this does not seem to extend to Heb 1-2, where the *stichwort* ἁγγελοι makes angels specifically the subject of inquiry. If ἁγγελοι are actually prophets, then one would surely expect ἁγγελοι rather than προφηται in 1:1.

but a case may be made that the source for such speculation, particularly in Hebrews, is most likely Deut 33:2,<sup>355</sup> whose LXX rendering places angels alongside YHWH at the mountain theophany.<sup>356</sup>

Deut 33:2 LXX	Deut 33:2 MT	Heb 2:2
κύριος ἐκ Σινᾶ ἦκει καὶ ἐπέφανεν ἐκ Σηιρ ἡμῖν καὶ κατέσπευσεν ἐξ ὄρους Φαραν σὺν μυριάσιν Καδης ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ	יְהוָה מִסִּינַי בְּאֵזְרוֹ זְרָחַת מִשְׁעִיר לְמוֹ הוֹפִיעַ מִהָר פֶּאֶרָן וְאֵתָה מִרְבַּבַּת קֹדֶשׁ מִיְמִינוֹ אֲשֶׁרֶת לְמוֹ	ὁ δὲ ἁγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος

The text of Deut 33:2 is problematic, especially within the MT.<sup>357</sup> The latter's final stich (מִיְמִינוֹ אֲשֶׁרֶת לְמוֹ) has translational complexities, as the various EVV testify,<sup>358</sup> but the LXX strongly attests the tradition of angelic presence accompanying YHWH at the gathering on Sinai.<sup>359</sup> Its rendering of the final stich as ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ parallels and restates σὺν μυριάσιν Καδης (33:2), probably best translated as 'with myriads of holy ones'.<sup>360</sup>

<sup>355</sup> Psalm 68:17 is also suggested in this regard, but this only attests the presence of a host of heavenly chariots; ἄγγελοι are not mentioned.

<sup>356</sup> Such Deuteronomic warrant is the consensus among commentators on both books: Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 393; Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 199-200; Koester, *Hebrews*, 205; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 67; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 138; Gheorgita, *Role*, 76-78, though he mistakenly attributes Deut 33:2 to the Song and not the Blessing of Moses.

<sup>357</sup> See Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 343-45; Wevers, *Notes*, 539-40.

<sup>358</sup> "From the south, from his mountain slopes" (NIV); "at his right, a host of his own" (NRSV, following LXX); "at His right hand there was flashing lightning for them" (NASB); "from his right hand went a fiery law for them" (KJV, following Targum Onkelos, Aquila, Symmachus). Wevers, *Notes*, 540 calls the final MT phrase אֲשֶׁרֶת לְמוֹ "completely opaque"; the Qere reads אֵשׁ דָּת (i.e. 'the fire of the law').

<sup>359</sup> Only in 33:2 does Deuteronomy use Σινᾶ; elsewhere the mountain is Χωρηβ.

<sup>360</sup> Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 344-45 retain Καδης as a transliterated proper noun ('avec les myriades de Kadès'), but the Jewish tradition's association of Καδης with holiness (i.e. translating קֹדֶשׁ, as in Aquila (ἀπὸ μυριάδων ἁγιοσμοῦ)) makes 'holy ones' a feasible rendering, especially in parallel to ἄγγελοι – so Wevers, *Notes*, 540n3.

It is possible that Heb 2:2 merely reflects contemporary views on angelic mediation, rather than a deliberate recourse to Deut 33:2. But Hebrews invariably ascribes scriptural warrant to his argument, and the letter appeals to Deut 32:8 (part of the same Mosaic farewell discourse) only three verses later (2:5).<sup>361</sup> Furthermore, the presence of μυριάσιν ἁγγέλων at Mount Zion (Heb 12:22) strongly recalls Deut 33:2's description of the Sinai moment (μυριάσιν .... ἅγγελοι), particularly if, as we shall subsequently argue, Zion's depiction is modelled on the Sinai covenant assembly.<sup>362</sup> Whilst the angelic retinue of Deut 33:2 is not specifically ascribed a mediatory role, their presence ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ implies the exercise of authority and power. It also resonates with Hebrews' own reference to YHWH's right hand, where the Son – and no angel – has sat down (1:3, 1:13, 8:1, 10:12, 12:2).

### **3.4.2 Deut 32:8/Heb 2:5**

The demise of angelic authority in the world to come (Heb 2:5) presupposes the subjugation of the present age to angels, and particularly their perceived role as guardians of the nations. Although this notion of angelic governance is reasonably commonplace within Jewish intertestamental literature (Sir 17:17, *Jub.* 15:32, 35:17; *1 En.* 56.5-6, 60:15-21),<sup>363</sup> it is probable that Hebrews derives the idea especially from Deut 32:8-9 LXX.<sup>364</sup> The Song's frequent citation (1:6, 2:1, 3:12, 4:12, 10:23, 10:25, 10:30a and 10:30b) reinforces the case for 2:5 alluding to 32:8, and the peculiar use of διαμαρτύρομαι (2:6) – as opposed to the customary λέγω – is analogous with the Song's 'witness' classification (cf. 32:46). The divine allocation of angelic authority (διεμέριζεν, Deut 32:8) also parallels YHWH's attestation of the new salvation as μερισμοῖς (Heb 2:4).

---

<sup>361</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 469 proposes that 33:2 harks back to the divine council motif of 32:8-9.

<sup>362</sup> See 6.2.2.

<sup>363</sup> See further L. T. Stuckenbruck, "Angels of the Nations," *DNTB*:29-31. Gleason, "Angels," 90-107 argues that Hebrews is countering a contemporary over-reliance on angelic protectors.

<sup>364</sup> Commentators generally assent that Deut 32:8 forms the backdrop for Heb 2:5 – cf. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 146-47; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 71; Wilson, *Hebrews*; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 41.

Deuteronomy 32:8's textual history is complex with distinctive Greek and proto-MT traditions.<sup>365</sup> Wevers' contention that υἱὼν θεοῦ is the original reading of the Old Greek tradition remains persuasive,<sup>366</sup> particularly in view of the respective testimonies of 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> and 848.<sup>367</sup> Despite its inferior volume of support, it is the harder reading theologically, and a monotheistically-motivated change to the less problematic ἀγγέλων θεοῦ seems logical.<sup>368</sup> However, the primacy of υἱὼν θεοῦ notwithstanding, the volume of textual support for ἀγγέλων θεοῦ demands that it be considered a 'mainstream' or 'accepted' reading.<sup>369</sup> Philo's attestation of ἀγγέλων θεοῦ (*Post.* 89; *Plant.* 59) and the already cited contemporary testimony of angelic governance further require that the 'sons of God' be understood angelmorphically. It is quite conceivable, bearing in mind Hebrews' general familiarity with the Alexandrian tradition which attests the mainstream reading, that his Deut 32:8 (and perhaps 32:43) read ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, and that specifically 'angels' – as opposed to the more ambiguous 'sons of god' – were the guardians of the nations in the Song.

At one level, Hebrews' appeal to Deut 32:8 merely demonstrates an awareness of the prior Deuteronomic text. It is primarily a reference point; the letter is interested not in 'this world' (of angels), but rather in that 'to come' (2:5). Yet this 'reference point' may not exhaust the contribution of 32:8. With its citation of Ps 8:5-7 LXX, Heb 2:6-8 develops the supremacy of the (son of) man, as the one who is now crowned with glory and honour (2:9); the human υἱὸς is elevated at the expense of the heavenly 'sons' of 2:5. What commentators generally fail to observe is how

---

<sup>365</sup> For MT בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, the Greek tradition reads either ἀγγέλων θεοῦ or υἱὼν θεοῦ. There is no need to rehearse the well-documented discussion of Deut 32:8-9's textual history, but the primacy of the Greek tradition is generally accepted (see Sanders, *Provenance*, 155-59, especially the bibliography in 156n81). Cf. Skehan, "Fragment," 12; Michael S. Heiser, "Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God," *BSac* 158 (2001): 52-74; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 135. For a view advocating MT primacy, cf. Knight, *Song*, 36-44. See also 3.1.1.2.

<sup>366</sup> Wevers, *History*, 85; also Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 325-26. In support of the originality of ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, see Robert Hanhart, "Die Söhne Israels, die Söhne Gottes und die Engel in der Masora, in Qumran und in der Septuaginta," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur Biblischen Hermeneutik, Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Christoph Bultmann, et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 170-78.

<sup>367</sup> 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> reads בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים.

<sup>368</sup> Wevers, *History*, 85.

<sup>369</sup> Rahlfs reads ἀγγέλων θεοῦ; it is the LXX reading for, among others, Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 69 and F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 71.

Deut 32:8 prepares the way for this anthropological shift. In 32:8, the parallelism is between the υἱοὺς Ἀδὰμ<sup>370</sup> and the ἀγγέλων (υἱῶν) θεοῦ; the 'human' sons are subordinated to their 'heavenly' counterparts for the ongoing protection of the nations. The interplay between human and heavenly sons is picked up by Heb 2:6-13, but with the roles reversed; it is the human one (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) – temporarily made lower than the heavenly ones – that is thenceforth ascribed authority over his former guardians and given pre-eminence over all things (2:9-10). The Son then leads other (human) sons into glory (2:10) and they join him in the heavenly congregation (2:12-13). Hebrews has overturned or rewritten the Deuteronomistic norm; the heavenly sons no longer guard the weakened sons of Adam (as in Deut 32:8), since the latter now inhabit a (superior) heavenly assembly of their own (cf. 12:23).

### **3.4.3 Deut 1:38, 3:28, 31:7, 31:23/Heb 4:8**

Joshua's failure to give Israel rest will receive detailed attention in 4.3.2 and it suffices here only to note that Hebrews is familiar with the Deuteronomistic expectation that Joshua would be the one designated to lead Israel into the Canaan rest (Deut 1:38, 3:28, 31:7, 31:23; cf. Josh 1:6). It is nevertheless worth observing that, in Deuteronomy at least, Joshua is never the ultimate agent of the rest – i.e. ἡσούς is never the subject of καταπαύω. When the verb is used transitively, specifically in relation to the gift of the land, the subject is always κύριος, and there is no human mediator.<sup>371</sup> Hebrews' proposition that Joshua never 'rested' Israel (4:8) is entirely correct, for that task was never assigned to him; it remained a divine prerogative (Deut 3:20; Josh 1:13, 22:4, 23:1).

### **3.5 Conclusion**

Within Hebrews, we have identified 6 quotations, 6 strong allusions (treating the Deuteronomistic imagery of 12:18-19 as a unity), 5 (possibly 6) echoes and 3 narrative

---

<sup>370</sup> A reading of υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in Deut 32:8 would clearly substantiate the argument further. No such reading is extant, but the context of the MT בְּנֵי אָדָם (the reference to ἔθνη/בְּנֵי) suggests a generally anthropological interpretation, rather than a specifically Adamic one (so Wevers, *Notes*, 513).

<sup>371</sup> But cf. Josh 10:20 for its use regarding rest from war.



allusions to the text of Deuteronomy. The majority of these references (11/21) derive from the third Mosaic speech (Deut 29-32), and 3 further citations originate from Deut 4, the parallel 'frame' to 29-32. The Song of Moses is of particular significance, yielding at least 8 specific references but also offering a profitable faithfulness/faithlessness paradigm for Hebrews to exploit within its paraenesis. This impressive and consistent textual use of Deuteronomy suggests that Hebrews has reflected upon its source text's narrative situation in order both to shape its hortatory purpose and to articulate evocatively the consequences of apostasy.

## Chapter 4: Thematic parallels between Hebrews and Deuteronomy

This chapter probes three themes common to Hebrews and Deuteronomy (covenant, blessing/cursing, land) and examines whether their respective treatments exhibit any shared approach or interpretation. It will be considered how such themes connect the two texts and provide insightful loci for intertextual exchange.

### 4.1 Introduction – covenant/ברית<sup>1</sup>

The definition and scope of ברית have featured amongst the mostly hotly debated topics in modern OT research.<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen found it to be a late development within Hebrew thought, a legal imposition or importation of Deuteronomic provenance that subverted the 'natural' relationship between YHWH and his people as reflected in the prophets.<sup>3</sup> His position was more recently defended and expanded by Perlitt, and subsequently Nicholson, both of whom understood ברית as essentially late, and foreign to the prophetic corpus.<sup>4</sup> Along similar lines, Kutsch proposes that ברית was fundamentally a unilateral obligation (*Verpflichtung*), derived from 'brh II' (Akk. barû – 'to see'), and denotes the act of 'seeing' or designating someone for a task (cf. 1 Sam 17:8).<sup>5</sup>

In contrast to the etymological method, other approaches have identified parallels between ברית material and the vassal treaties of the ANE, and so discerned a particular 'covenant formula' structure. G. E. Mendenhall's appeal to the Hittite suzerainty treaties of the second millennium BCE as the source for covenant material

---

<sup>1</sup> An English definition of ברית is problematic, as post-war OT research has demonstrated. 'Covenant', however, still remains the best definition, so long as one does not import modern conceptions of covenant or *Bund*.

<sup>2</sup> For a broad review of twentieth century ברית scholarship, see Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 3-117.

<sup>3</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 417-19.

<sup>4</sup> Lothar Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), passim; Nicholson, *God*, 191-217. Cf. Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Religion in the Old Testament: The History of a Spiritual Triumph* (London: A&C Black, 1961), 55: "Every mention of the covenant of Jehovah with Israel in the Bible is later than 621."

<sup>5</sup> E. Kutsch, "Berit (Obligation)," *TLOT* 1:256-66. Moshe Weinfeld, "Berit," *TDOT* 2:253-79 concurs with some obligatory referent for ברית, but he differs from Kutsch's etymology, appealing instead to the Akkadian 'biritu' – clasp or fetter – as the term's probable source.

was taken up and developed by Kline who sought to apply the treaty structure particularly to Deuteronomy.<sup>6</sup> These treaty parallels have met with some broad approval,<sup>7</sup> though scholars have also appealed to 7<sup>th</sup> century BCE Assyrian versions as more pertinent models, especially for Deuteronomy.<sup>8</sup> The current consensus seems to accord an analogous significance to the treaty structure, but without pronouncing absolute certainty as to the precise provenance. McConville also notes that the treaty form "has a bilateral character, which ill agrees with Kutsch's view of covenant as 'obligation' (whether assumed or imposed)."<sup>9</sup>

ברית has ceased to be a univocal term, with a distinction drawn between covenants involving humans (rulers, marriage partners *inter alia*) and those linking God and human agency. Of the latter, broad dissimilarity has been identified between the promissory covenant (or 'royal grant'), manifesting a unilateral, unconditional divine commitment, and the obligatory variety, which imposes responsibilities or commitments upon the inferior human party.<sup>10</sup> The Abraham promise is traditionally associated with the former category, the Sinai covenant with

---

<sup>6</sup> G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *BA* 17 (1954): 50-76; Kline, *Treaty*, 13-44. See also Klaus Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 9-93. Broadly speaking, the treaty categories are:

1. Preamble
2. Historical Prologue
3. Covenant Stipulations
4. Requirements for the regular re-reading and preservation of the covenant
5. Witnesses to the treaty
6. Blessings/Curses formula

<sup>7</sup> Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 22-24; Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; 2 vols.; London: SCM, 1975), 1.132-33.

<sup>8</sup> Dennis J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament* (AnBib 21; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), 109-167 rejects the application of the treaty model to the Exodus Sinai covenant but strongly affirms its pertinence for Deuteronomy. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomism*, 59-157 includes Assyrian treaty texts within the scope and evolution of Deuteronomy, but stresses the latter's addition of law-code material.

<sup>9</sup> Gordon J. McConville, "ברית," *NIDOTTE* 1:747-55. Moshe Weinfeld, "B<sup>c</sup>rît - Covenant Vs Obligation," *Bib* 56 (1975): 120-28 also critiques Kutsch's thesis for lacking "reciprocity."

<sup>10</sup> David Noel Freedman and David Miano, "People of the New Covenant," in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C R. De Roo; SJSJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 7-13.

the latter.<sup>11</sup> The Davidic covenant has been applied to both dispositions,<sup>12</sup> but the consensus favours the promissory mode, with some additional responsibility on the part of the Davidic line.<sup>13</sup> The categorisation of the new covenant (NC) of Jer 31 is similarly disputed.<sup>14</sup> Freedman/Miano contend that it falls outside of either conditional or promissory paradigm, for it conceives of humanity in an "ideal state." Neither party requires obligation or responsibility and instead an entirely new societal order is foreseen.<sup>15</sup> Depiction of the NC also varied between communities; at Qumran, for example, it was a return to the Sinai covenant, lacking Hebrews' characteristic old/new opposition.<sup>16</sup>

Responding to Kutsch's *Verpflichtung* designation, recent scholarship has emphasized the aspect of ברית that establishes a relationship with a non-kinsman, rather than merely extracting obligation. Working within the context of the covenantal nature of marriage, Hugenberger defines ברית as "an elected, as opposed to natural, relationship of obligation established under divine sanction."<sup>17</sup> The benefit of this definition is manifold: i) it recognizes both the relationship and the requisite obligation, preserving both elements without reducing ברית purely to either aspect;

---

<sup>11</sup> Weinfeld, *TDOT* 2:265-75. Thomas Edward McComiskey, *The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants* (Nottingham: InterVarsity, 1985), 139 differentiates between the promissory covenant as one that "elicits the response of trust" (i.e. not administered) and the administrative covenant where obedience is codified or formulated.

<sup>12</sup> See the contrasting views of M. Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Ancient near East," *JAOS* 90 (1970): 184-203; G. N. Knoppers, "Ancient near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?" *JAOS* 116 (1996): 60-97.

<sup>13</sup> Scott Hahn, "Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994-2004)," *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2005): 270 advocates a mediating position. It is a covenant of "divine commitment," but with certain conditions placed upon the human party.

<sup>14</sup> McComiskey, *Covenants*, 144-71 understands it as conditional, whilst Fredrick C. Holmgren, *The Old Testament & the Significance of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 75-95 finds it a return to and reaffirmation of the Sinai covenant; 'new' is used ironically.

<sup>15</sup> Freedman and Miano, "People," 21-26. Cf. Michael Duane Morrison, "Rhetorical Function of the Covenant Motif in the Argument of Hebrews" (PhD diss, Fuller Theological Seminary, 2006), 122: "By God's action, a bilateral covenant is turned into a unilateral obligation... God obligates himself to fulfil the responsibilities of *both* parties."

<sup>16</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Community of the Renewed Covenant," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Charles Ulrich and James C. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3-24; Craig A. Evans, "Covenant in the Qumran Literature," in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo; SJSJ 71; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 55-80; Lehne, *New*, 50-51.

<sup>17</sup> Gordon Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage, Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (VTSup 52; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 171, 174.

ii) it orientates the debate away from the purely legal or contractual aspect of covenantal praxis; and iii) acknowledges that a divine-human covenant has a performative aspect, commonly a cultic or liturgical act associated with the process of covenant renewal. Covenant is an act with a relational context, not merely a contractual exchange.

#### **4.1.1 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and Covenant Obligation**

By offering some backdrop and context to the question, this potted history of covenant scholarship facilitates understanding the type of covenantal exchange evoked in both Deuteronomy and Hebrews. Deuteronomy's covenantal ontology is well known; it is "pre-eminently a covenant document,"<sup>18</sup> whose structure and rhetoric approximate contemporary ANE treaties.<sup>19</sup> Covenantal discourse, responsibilities, witnesses and sanctions pervade its very core; it is not just 'covenantal', it verges on a 'covenant,' and it is likely that 28:69-30:20 MT (introduced by אֱלֹהֵי דְבָרֵי הַבְּרִית<sup>20</sup>) particularly exhibit the structure of a formal covenant agreement.<sup>21</sup>

In view of its Sinaitic re-presentation and vassal treaty affiliation, Deuteronomy is commonly grouped under the 'obligatory' classification of covenant.<sup>22</sup> Israel has a responsibility to keep the covenant; the land gift is conditional and God will act for them only if they remain obedient to him and keep the covenant's terms. Whilst such conditionality is clearly seminal for Deuteronomy,

---

<sup>18</sup> Dennis J. McCarthy, *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972), 22; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 36 asserts that Deuteronomy is a "covenant document."

<sup>19</sup> Kline, *Treaty*, 27-44; McCarthy, *Treaty*, 109-40; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 6-9; Wright, *Deuteronomy (NIBC)*, 2-3; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, xiv-xv. For a more sceptical view of the treaties' significance, see Nicholson, *God*, 56-82.

<sup>20</sup> Reading 29:1 as a superscript because of its parallels with other introductory passages – 1:1, 4:44, 33:1. So Gerhard von Rad, *Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium* (BWANT 47; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1929), 178; Barker, *Triumph*, 110-12; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 360; McConville and Millar, *Time*, 77; Lohfink, "Bundesschluss," 32-36; Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 297-98; Nicholson, *Deuteronomy*, 35. The following read it as a subscript: Wright, *Deuteronomy (NIBC)*, 284; Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy*, 160; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 353; Wevers, *Notes*, 461; MT.

<sup>21</sup> See the structural assessment of McCarthy, *Treaty*, 136-38; cf. also Alexander Rofé, "The Covenant in the Land of Moab (Dt 28,69-30,20): Historico-Literary, Comparative, and Formcritical Considerations," in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), 318.

<sup>22</sup> Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 6-9.

two important caveats must be noted. First, the promise to Abraham, manifested in the divine land gift, is regularly appealed to as the grounds of YHWH's faithfulness to Israel (1:8, 4:31, 9:5, 29:13, 30:20) and the land inheritance is almost always depicted as that promise sworn to the fathers. In the midst of Israel's unfaithfulness with the golden calf, it is YHWH's dealings with Abraham to which Moses appeals (9:27) as the grounds for mercy to disobedient Israel. To label Deuteronomy as 'conditional' is thus overly reductive:

Deut, in fact, is notable for bringing together the patriarchal (Abrahamic) covenant, primarily a sworn promise focused on the land and blessing (4:31), with that of Sinai ..., in which command comes to greater prominence (5:1-2). In fact, Deut achieves a careful balance *between promise and command*, between God's initiative and Israel's required response.<sup>23</sup>

Similarly, in relation to Deut 29-32 – the part of Deuteronomy that is both self-avowedly covenantal and the portion most favoured by Hebrews – Olson suggests that the Deuteronomic mode of command has shifted to one of promise: "commanded *human* action has now become a promised *divine* gift."<sup>24</sup> Although the Moab covenant of Deut 29-30 fits well with the vassal treaty structure, it is made in the realisation that Israel's sin and apostasy is prevalent and promised divine grace therefore assumes pre-eminence, especially in 30:1-10. Deuteronomy's covenantal horizon is more blurred than the regularly espoused promissory/conditional dichotomy.

Second, the text hints at some form of original covenant renewal ceremony or celebration associated with Deuteronomy (26:16-19, 27:1-8, 29:9-15, 31:10-13; cf. Josh 24:1-27), an event commented upon by a number of scholars when attempting

---

<sup>23</sup> McConville, *NIDOTTE* 1:749, my emphasis. Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 174-76 proposes that the tension is reflected in Deuteronomy's juxtaposition of the Horeb covenant (human obedience) with that of Moab (divine promise). See also Kline, *Treaty*, 38-39; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, xiv; Delbert R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969), 154-55. Thomas Römer, "The Book of Deuteronomy," in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (ed. Steven L. McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham; JSOTSup 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 204-08 argues that the association of 'forefathers' with the patriarchs was a post-exilic redaction, with אבות originally referring to the Horeb generation. The redaction reinforced Pentateuchal unity, with Genesis-Deuteronomy corporately associating the promise with the patriarchs.

<sup>24</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 127, his emphasis. Cf. Lenchak, *Choose*, 241: "the double mention of God's promise to the ancestors (29:12, 30:20) also seems to contribute to the notion of covenant an unconditional element."

to reconstruct the book's history.<sup>25</sup> Detailed discussion of their diachronic conclusions is beyond our scope here, but it is hard to ignore the evidence of creedal pledges (6:3-9), covenantal recital (5:2-22; 29:1-30:20) and cultic rehearsal (27:9-10) as testimony to some liturgical association. It seems, therefore, that Deuteronomy does not just espouse covenantal obligation, but also places it within an act of cultic renewal; its conception of ברית is more than just conditions and obligations. Covenant in Deuteronomy has vitality; it is to be acted upon, celebrated and renewed.

If ברית is paramount in Deuteronomy, it is barely less so in Hebrews if usage of διαθήκη offers any guide. Διαθήκη is almost universally used of ברית in the LXX; it appears 28 times in Deuteronomy (and 31 more in the associated Joshua), and 17 times in Hebrews, more frequently than in any other NT text.<sup>26</sup> When it uses διαθήκη in this ברית sense, Hebrews confines its reference to the Sinaitic provision and to the NC of Jer 31:31-34;<sup>27</sup> the Abrahamic covenant is instead classed under ἐπαγγελία (6:15, 7:6, 11:13, 11:17).<sup>28</sup> Διαθήκη as a concept is introduced in 7:22 without further explanation and one assumes the theme was one with which the audience was already broadly familiar.<sup>29</sup> We will revisit the semantic domain of διαθήκη in chapter 5, specifically whether Hebrews' usage reflects the LXX rendering of ברית or the more broadly Hellenistic concept of 'testament,'<sup>30</sup> but our present working assumption is that the appeal to Sinai provenance and related imagery (8:7-9, 9:1, 9:4) permits at least some element of ברית to be operative within the letter.

---

<sup>25</sup> Gerhard von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966), 1-78; Nicholson, *Deuteronomy*, 38-47.

<sup>26</sup> Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, "The Church in Hebrews," in *Vision for the Church* (ed. Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Michael B. Thompson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 141 describes Hebrews as exhibiting "a uniquely *covenantal* understanding of the Christian message" (his emphasis).

<sup>27</sup> Although LXX Jeremiah renders the NC discourse in 38:31-34, we adopt the scholarly consensus of classifying it under its MT location, Jer 31:31-34.

<sup>28</sup> Lehne, *New*, 19-22.

<sup>29</sup> David Peterson, "The Prophecy of the New Covenant in the Argument of Hebrews," *RTR* 36-38 (1978): 74.

<sup>30</sup> See 5.1.3.

It is not our intention here to assess the doctrinal, cultic, liturgical and theological dimensions of διαθήκη, significant though they may be.<sup>31</sup> Our concern is less with the inauguration of the NC, than with the ramifications and expectations engendered through its inception. We will concentrate on the way in which covenantal *obligation* functions within the letter, especially within the paraenetic framework. Following Hugenburger's definition of covenant as "relationship of obligation established under divine sanction,"<sup>32</sup> we will assess the extent to which such obligation is operative within Hebrews. If the covenantal DNA of Deuteronomy holds promise and obligation in tension, it remains to be seen whether Hebrews exhibits a similar balance between the two themes. In particular, it will need to be seen whether Hebrews' NC is purely promissory, or whether it requires an obligation on the part of the NC community.

In a detailed thesis on biblical covenant imagery, Scott Hahn proposes that Hebrews' NC differs from the Sinai dispensation in that the former is promissory and the latter essentially obligatory; to attempt any comparison of the two covenants is to compare two essentially different and separate dispositions.<sup>33</sup> For Hahn, the key question is who swears the oath – YHWH or the people. At Sinai, the vassal makes the vow, yet within Hebrews' NC discourse, YHWH himself always fulfils that role (Heb 6:13, 6:17, 7:21-22, 7:28), thus rendering it a grant type covenant. Aspects of promissory covenant-making are indeed undeniable in Hebrews – the appeal to the faithfulness of both YHWH (6:13-20) and Jesus (3:1-6), confirmed by sworn oath (6:17-18) and the ἁπαξ action of Christ as high priest, all testify to a unilateral divine action. Similarly, the Davidic motif signalled in 1:5/5:5 alludes to key elements of the royal grant covenant type (cf. 2 Sam 7:14).

One wonders, however, whether such a differentiation may be made in terms of the obligation each covenant demands. We have already suggested that Deuteronomic covenant discourse does not sit easily with the notion of pure

---

<sup>31</sup> See Lehne, *New*, 93-124. She outlines two distinctive elements to Hebrews' NC understanding. The NC is *new*, distinct from its old, now obsolete, predecessor (the "contrast" element), yet is also invested with a cultic and liturgical dimension, which, though foreign to Jer 31:31-34, is in "continuity" with Israel's story. See also Peterson, "Prophecy," 74-81; Scott Walker Hahn, "Kinship by Covenant: A Biblical Theological Study of Covenant Types and Texts in the Old and New Testaments" (PhD, Marquette University, 1995), 490-633.

<sup>32</sup> Hugenburger, *Marriage*, 171.

<sup>33</sup> Hahn, "Kinship", 490-633.



obligation, and militates against any simplistic distinction between grant and treaty covenants. Likewise, the strength of the hortatory passages in Hebrews and the implied urgency of the warnings against apostasy surely demand some form of response from the audience that may be viewed as 'obligation'. Just as YHWH rejected the people on account of their unfaithfulness to the old covenant (8:9), so the NC community are exhorted against similar unfaithfulness and urged to ongoing obedience (3:7-19, 10:26-31). McCarthy, furthermore, observes that the idea of an unconditional covenant is unrealistic, even within the promissory genre,<sup>34</sup> and the abundance of hortatory material in the letter bears this out. Hence we propose a working hypothesis: the inauguration of the NC is unilateral in that it was initiated solely by divine, christological action, but its ongoing observance and adherence is avowedly bilateral, with faithfulness and obedience demanded from the NC community (especially 10:19-31, but also 2:1-4; 3:7-19, 5:11-6:12; 12:1-17, 25-29). We thus differ from Hahn in his neglect of the obedience expected from Hebrews' audience, an obedience that imposes some form of 'obligation' upon them.<sup>35</sup>

To justify our hypothesis, we must ask whether covenantal obedience is an internal aspect of Hebrews' διαθήκη (*a stipulation*, that is, part of its actual content), or an external, structural aspect of covenant (its prevailing contractual framework or 'scaffolding'). If obedience is merely external, if Hebrews' exhortatory material is only structural apparatus of covenantal discourse, or worse, unrelated exhortations divorced from a purely unilateral covenant inaugurated by Christ, then to speak of Deuteronomic covenantal affinities in Hebrews becomes somewhat anachronistic. The latter possibility can be dismissed fairly easily, as most scholars find a fundamental connection between the doctrine and exhortations.<sup>36</sup> For Hebrews, "theology is in the service of exhortation,"<sup>37</sup> and this is marked by the frequent use of causative or explanatory conjunctions which link the doctrinal passages with the consequent exhortations (οὖν – 10:19; γὰρ – 10:26, 6:4; ὅθεν – 3:1; διό – 3:7; διὰ

---

<sup>34</sup> McCarthy, *Old*, 3: "all covenants, all contracts have their conditions. They must be defined somehow or other."

<sup>35</sup> Hahn omits any discussion of Heb 10-12, where covenantal paraenesis reaches its zenith.

<sup>36</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, 19-22; Hughes, *Hermeneutics*, 72.

<sup>37</sup> David Peterson, "God and Scripture in Hebrews," in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture* (ed. Paul Helm and Carl R. Trueman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 118. Cf. Michel, *Brief*, 27.

τοῦτο – 2:1; τοιγαρὺν – 12:1). Dunnill's assessment aligns Hebrews and Deuteronomy on this point:

Like Deuteronomy, Hebrews alternates between rehearsal of God's saving actions, especially in Jesus (1:1-4, 2:1-4, 5:7-10, 6:17f) and exhortations to respond to these with obedience (3:6, 10:19, 12:25), marking the transition from one mode to another by repeated use of 'because', 'therefore' and their cognates.<sup>38</sup>

As to whether the hortatory material is ultimately only structural, the Deuteronomic example is similarly apposite. Obedience is a fundamental covenantal stipulation (Deut 6:1-3, 11:8-9, 12:1, 26:16-19, 29:9), not something external or separate from the law set before Israel at Moab. Torah's existence was founded upon its efficacy and its praxis; obedience to do it goes to the very heart of the covenant. Blessings and curses – not obedience itself – fulfil the structural role within Deuteronomy; they articulate the rewards/penalties imposed when the covenantal terms are upheld or broken.

Hebrews is no different, and we shall argue for the use of similar blessing/cursing sanction in the next section. Obedience and faithfulness are instead part of the covenantal package, intrinsically included within the NC discourse. It is helpful to distinguish here between the christological *content* of the covenant and the accompanying mutual *responsibility* or *conditions* that make it living or efficacious (though both aspects remain part of the one covenant). Within the exposition of Jer 31:31-34, Hebrews does not directly exhort the audience to obedience; unlike 3:7-19, for example, the exegesis is essentially doctrinal rather than hortatory, the NC's superiority explicated through dogmatic categories such as tabernacle worship (9:1-10) and sacrificial efficacy (9:11-14, 9:26, 10:1-14). Human responsibility, however, is not excluded from this covenantal discourse and practical response accompanies the exposition's outworking, especially in 10:19-25. As this response is clothed in the same liturgical and sacramental language as the preceding exposition, one suggests that the response to the sacrifice of Christ (10:19-39) is as much part of the NC as the inferior/superior discourse of 8:1-10:18. If the covenant is not fully embraced and affirmed (for example, by regular participation within the community – 10:25), its efficacy is irretrievably lost (10:26; 12:16-17). "Hebrews sees no saving faith apart

---

<sup>38</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 133.

from obedience";<sup>39</sup> πίστις may be a means to an end (i.e. τελείωσις – cf. 11:39-40), but is also an end in itself within Hebrews' futurist eschatology. Christ is held up as the embodiment of πίστις, the one whose faithfulness is to be modelled (Heb 12:1-2). In her analysis of the NC, Lehne rightly stresses the practical responsibilities that accompany participation within the NC community and classifies the hortatory passages *within* the overall NC framework, rather than being divorced from them.<sup>40</sup> Other scholars seem to concur with this assessment. Göran Forkman, for example, proposes that Hebrews "interprets the voluntary apostasy of a member *with terms and Old Testament passages which belong to the thought of the covenant*."<sup>41</sup> DeSilva locates such covenantal discourse within patron-client relations, and whilst we do not fully endorse his categories,<sup>42</sup> the honour/shame exchange is both intrinsic to covenantal discourse and enacted through obligations on each party. To confine our attention to Hebrews' elucidation of covenantal obligation is to remain within the parameters of its covenantal discourse.

Whilst the NC has displaced the former dispensation in terms of cultic praxis and consequently revised the grounds for community membership, its futurist dimension still dictates that obedience is a responsibility for the believer. To this extent at least, NC praxis remains demonstrably bilateral. The audience's reception of the NC is contingent upon their (faithful) action; their *need* for endurance (ἔχετε χρεῖαν – 10:36) implies a potential condition in which they are not beneficiaries of the covenantal blessings. The audience are only Christ's house *if* they hold on to their courage and hope (3:6); *if* they do not experience παιδεία, they are not true sons (12:8); should they apostatize from the community, there is no longer sacrifice for sin (10:29). Although Hebrews never invests διαθήκη specifically with

---

<sup>39</sup> Brenda B. Colijn, "'Let Us Approach': Soteriology in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JETS* 39 (1996): 574. Johnson, *Hebrews*, 212 urges readers of the letter to "focus on ... what Hebrews insists is the rigorous demand of obedience imposed by the new covenant."

<sup>40</sup> Lehne, *New*, 104-08: "(T)he covenantal perspective, while seldom explicit in the paraenesis, is always upheld by the author" (106). On how 'covenant' contributes to Hebrews' paraenesis, see Morrison, "Rhetorical", 179-87.

<sup>41</sup> Göran Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity* (ConBNT 5; Lund: Gleerup, 1972), 193, my emphasis. See also 176-77.

<sup>42</sup> David A. deSilva, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SBLDS 152; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), passim. Our belief is that the LXX, rather than Greco-Roman social convention, is the primary key for understanding the letter; neither 'patron' nor 'client' are mentioned in the text.

contractual terms, how the community respond to and embrace the NC is key to its efficacy,<sup>43</sup> not a derivative or secondary factor.<sup>44</sup>

Such (new) covenantal obligation therefore retains the same promissory/conditional tension as the old dispensation; both Deuteronomy and Hebrews articulate a covenantal framework that combines unilateral divine action with some response of human obedience. Even in the epistle's promissory NC, "the life of the believer stands essentially under the demand of God. Responsibility has become greater for Christians than it was for Israel."<sup>45</sup> The christological and cultic grounds for membership within the community may be distinct from the former covenant, and may be predicated upon a unique, once-for-all, non-repeatable action, but the fundamental principle of covenantal exchange and obligation between YHWH and his people is common to both economies. Although the several *a fortiori* arguments imply an expansion in severity and punishment (2:2-3, 10:28-29, 12:25), differences between old and new covenant obedience are ones of scale, not of ontology or expectation. Just as Deut 30:19 lays a choice before Israel to accept the (new) Moab covenant, so Hebrews offers its audience a similar decision, to embrace the NC or to forfeit its blessings.

#### **4.1.2 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and the Centrality of Covenant**

Beyond their shared promissory/conditional dimension, covenant is a suitable category for expressing the relationship between Hebrews and Deuteronomy primarily because it remains fundamental to both documents. It is not merely a theme of each text; it goes to the very heart of their existence and message. Hebrews may not be so ostentatiously covenantal as the (potentially) treaty-structured Deuteronomy, but διαθήκη still runs to the core of its argument. Lehne comments: "(d)espite his philosophical bent, the author chooses the scriptural metaphor of

---

<sup>43</sup> Johnson, *Hebrews*, 214 notes that Hebrews' NC discourse "should be seen less as asserting a theological position than as expressing a community conviction."

<sup>44</sup> Isaacs' contention that Hebrews' "use of the covenant theme is predominantly in terms of Jesus as covenant victim, rather than the Christian church as covenant community" (*Sacred*, 121) thus underestimates the way in which covenant is used for paraenetic purposes. The warning passages are covenantally geared (especially 10:19-31) and receive covenantal blessing/curse sanction (6:7-8, 12:15-17), whilst the Zion assembly (12:22-24) is a covenantal gathering modelled on Sinai.

<sup>45</sup> Bultmann, *Theology*, 166.

covenant as a suitable means of expressing his convictions about the person and work of Christ."<sup>46</sup> Whilst it would overstate the case to describe Hebrews as *generically* covenantal (as is oft stated of Deuteronomy), the text nonetheless communicates in language and rhetoric characteristic of covenant such that διαθήκη becomes the argument's controlling feature. It is a "Bundes-Theologie."<sup>47</sup>

This notion of Hebrews as 'covenant', particularly beyond the christological and cultic exposition of Jer 31, is still, however, greeted with abundant scepticism. Delbert Hillers is typical in his assessment of (old) covenantal ideas in the letter:

How much is left here of the ancient concept of covenant as an oath sworn by man which places him under strict obligation and under a curse if he is faithless? The answer is obvious. At least at this point in the book (i.e. chs. 8 and 9), these essential features of the old covenant are absent. Christ so dominates the conception that there is little attention paid to the role of human partners in the covenant.<sup>48</sup>

Hillers contends that covenantal curses are far more prevalent in the Qumran literature than in the NT;<sup>49</sup> this may be the case for NT texts other than Hebrews, but, as we shall see below, blessings and curses are actually the fundamental categories through which NC obedience is regulated. We find more persuasive the conclusions of John Dunnill, who is perhaps the most ardent proponent of covenant ideology within Hebrews. He argues that the letter creates a new covenantal system that is the very lifeblood of the community's liturgical life;<sup>50</sup> with its replication or representation of the Day of Atonement, Hebrews becomes a Christian covenant-renewal rite that replaces the regular reaffirmation of the old covenant within contemporary Judaism, a renewal akin to that found in Deuteronomy 28-30. As such, Hebrews' scheme is "deeply interfused with covenant-symbolism of Judaism, which is presupposed as the context of their meaning."<sup>51</sup> Dunnill particularly appeals

---

<sup>46</sup> Lehne, *New*, 119.

<sup>47</sup> Erich Grässer, *Der Alte Bund im Neuen: Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament* (WUNT 35; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985), 96.

<sup>48</sup> Hillers, *Covenant*, 182.

<sup>49</sup> Hillers, *Covenant*, 182.

<sup>50</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 115-260

<sup>51</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 126.

to Deuteronomy for Hebrews' depiction of covenant renewal and in so doing, extends the boundaries of reference for διαθήκη by stressing covenant as performative act rather than just relational exchange.

In the *Liturgy for the Day of Salvation* presented here we see ... the life of the Christian community viewed as a liminal state, a *standing before God*, and as a sacral action, a *drawing near to the throne of grace*, a 'system-affirming event' by which the system of the divine-human relations (the 'covenant') is renewed; that is both affirmed and changed.<sup>52</sup>

This becomes the entry point in his elucidation of the common rhetorical grounds of Hebrews and Deuteronomy, which we will probe further in chapter 5. Whilst our own study does not follow Dunnill's avowedly structuralist perspective, we find his thematic association of Hebrews and Deuteronomy on covenantal grounds compelling. Hebrews may not label itself a covenant, but its paraenetic appeal, its λόγος παρακλήσεως, is couched in covenantal terms and is premised upon a new 'cult' which has already been sacrificed once and for all. Covenant – both old and new – form the backbone of the whole book.

Whilst it does not re-present the treaty format paralleled by Deuteronomy, Hebrews nonetheless shares significant covenantal ingredients or raw material reflective of the treaty milieu, and not just amidst the NC exposition of chapters 8-10. Lehne's NC analysis, for example, utilizes treaty categories when suggesting that the "elaborate expositions about the Christ event can be regarded as kind of 'historical prologue' for the 'stipulations' governing life under the NC."<sup>53</sup> Covenantal obedience is sanctioned with blessings and curses (Heb 6:4-8, 12:14-17; cf. Deut 11:26-32, 28:1-30:20), whilst witnesses vindicate the covenant's efficacy and monitor its ongoing observance (12:1: cf. Deut 32:1), with YHWH himself testifying to its inauguration with signs and wonders (2:4). Mount Zion is cast as a scene of 'covenant conclusion' (12:22-24) akin to that of Sinai;<sup>54</sup> leadership succession arrangements are enacted, a normal accompaniment to covenant renewal.<sup>55</sup> Where

---

<sup>52</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 123.

<sup>53</sup> Lehne, *New*, 107. She also observes (106) that Hebrews uses blessing/cursing language taken from the realm of ANE treaties.

<sup>54</sup> Peterson, "Scripture," 135; Dumbrell, "Spirits," 154-59.

<sup>55</sup> Baltzer, *Covenant*, 63-83.

Deuteronomy marked the transfer of power from Moses to Joshua, Hebrews similarly marks the succession of the new ἡγουσ (3:1-6, 4:8).<sup>56</sup>

For both Hebrews and Deuteronomy, covenant is not merely a set of stipulations or propositions about YHWH/Christ, but rather a framework for corporate living that permeates each audience's entire community existence, sociological and religious.<sup>57</sup> It is a relational concept, affecting relationships with both YHWH and one another, hence the emphasis upon meeting together as the benchmark of covenant obedience (Heb 10:23-25; 13:1). This relational element must be particularly stressed in the case of Hebrews, for, since διαθήκη's occurrences predominate in 8:1-10:18, it tends to be reduced purely to a doctrinal term. This is, however, not the case; as Michael Morrison concludes, "'covenant' is the term that links doctrine and paraenesis in the argument of Hebrews."<sup>58</sup> It unites both epistolary trajectories.

#### **4.1.3 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and the Notion of 'New Covenant'**

We must now deal with a key objection to linking Deuteronomy and Hebrews along covenantal lines, namely Hebrews' exposition of a NC which sounds the death knell of that articulated at Sinai and renewed/developed at Moab (7:18; 8:7-8; 8:13; 12:18). One response to this objection is to limit the scope to which the old covenant is rendered defunct. Whereas the doctrinal sections clearly articulate a redundancy and imminent demise for the old covenant, Graham Hughes has persuasively argued that, in contrast, the letter's paraenetic sections exhibit continuity with the OT – they become the present forms of the word of God in the futurist eschatology of the

---

<sup>56</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 134; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 358: "the installation of a new leader is a subject with close covenant associations." See 5.2.2.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Iutisone Salevao, *Legitimation in the Letter to the Hebrews: The Construction and Maintenance of a Symbolic Universe* (JSNTSup 219; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 329-30. The NC is made with a community/house (οἶκος), not individuals – see R. Martin-Achard, "Quelques Remarques sur la Nouvelle Alliance chez Jérémie (Jer. 31,31-34)," in *Questions Disputées d'Ancien Testament: Méthode et Théologie* (ed. C. Brekelmans; BETL 33; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974), 155. Cf. also Pate, *Communities*, 199 on Hebrews' audience and the Qumran community: "both groups believed themselves to be the true Israel, who represented the one God and whose *communities* constituted the New Covenant of the last days" (my emphasis). The NC is communally enacted, not merely 'believed.'

<sup>58</sup> Morrison, "Rhetorical", 187.

letter.<sup>59</sup> The epistle's paraenetic elements retain an ongoing validity and remain intrinsic to NC observance. Once again, Hebrews' NC is both doctrine *and* obligation, not doctrine alone.

This doctrine/paraenesis split does not, however, solve the related question of how far Deuteronomy is receptive to NC imagery; i.e. does Deuteronomy articulate or foresee any covenantal disposition that is characterised as ontologically 'new' or distinct from previous epochs? The primary issue is the relationship between Jer 31:31-34 and Deuteronomy, particularly Deut 30:1-10. The scholarly consensus recognizes similarities between the two texts, affirming their affinities, but at the same time emphasizing the fundamental differences between them. Potter perhaps represents the extreme end of scepticism when he avers of Jer 31: "the whole point of these verses is that they are a deliberate contrast to Deuteronomy, not a complement to it, or a restatement of it."<sup>60</sup> Lehne is similarly sceptical, equating Deut 30:1-10 instead with Bar 2:30-35 on the grounds that human, as well as divine, initiative is operative. She ventures that Deut 30 anticipates a restoration of an existing covenant rather than the inauguration of something inherently new.<sup>61</sup> Holladay notes that, whilst the first half of Jer 31:31-34 is "strongly reminiscent of Deuteronomy,"<sup>62</sup> the second half departs from it. Most notably, the removal of the need to teach the NC stands in opposition to the frequent Deuteronomic exhortation to teach the commandments to your children (4:9, 6:7, 11:9, 32:46).<sup>63</sup> The inscription of the commandments on the people's hearts (31:33) also varies significantly from the old covenant's writing on stone tablets and, even when Deuteronomy adopts a more YHWH-centred action in chapters 29-32, it has a restorative, rather than an inaugural, dimension. Israel will 'return' to him (30:2) and obey the laws and commands set before them (30:10, 15-16). It is evident, therefore, that Jer 31:31-34 anticipates a covenantal dispensation that is ontologically distinct from the primary Deuteronomic agenda.<sup>64</sup> There is, in Jeremiah, something 'new'.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Hughes, *Hermeneutics*, 66-74.

<sup>60</sup> Harry D. Potter, "The New Covenant in Jeremiah 31:31-34," *VT* 33 (1983): 350.

<sup>61</sup> Lehne, *New*, 38.

<sup>62</sup> William L. Holladay and Paul D. Hanson, *Jeremiah* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 2.164.

<sup>63</sup> Holladay and Hanson, *Jeremiah*, 2.198-99.

<sup>64</sup> The comparison in Jer 31:32 (38:32 LXX) to the previous covenant, when YHWH led Israel by the hand out of Egypt, probably reflects a Deuteronomic reading of the event (Deut 1:31, 33). In the



But one wonders whether, in highlighting the differences between the respective texts, one erroneously divorces them and glosses over their similarities, particularly in the context of Hebrews. Whilst they are not indistinguishable,<sup>66</sup> both OT texts anticipate divine action upon Israel's heart (Deut 30:6, Jer 31:33) that is somehow different from prior covenantal exchange. For Jeremiah, this is explicit (31:31-32), but for Deuteronomy it is only barely less so; as we have observed above, the (promissory) Moab covenant of chapters 29-30 changes Deuteronomy's covenantal framework and, contra Lehne, YHWH does indeed become the primary protagonist. Circumcision of the heart, formerly a human task, is now a divine initiative (30:6) and he will bring back his people to the point of repentance. Driver ascribes messianic overtones to the reference<sup>67</sup> and the verb used in Deut 30:6 is particularly pertinent; rather than περιτέμνω (10:16), the same MT root (מול) is rendered by περικαθαρίζω, strongly reminiscent of Hebrews' own language. In Heb 9:14 (cf. also 9:22, 10:2), the blood of Christ cleanses (καθαρίζω) the conscience and moves the believer from the realm of death to that of the living God (9:14), an impossible function under the former covenant (9:9).

Although the heartbeat of the old covenant, Deuteronomy ultimately concedes that the current covenantal situation is inherently flawed. Israel's repeated faithlessness (9:22-24, 29:25-28, 31:27) and the numerical superiority of Deuteronomic curses compared to blessings (27:14-28:68) necessitate a new, unilateral divine action (30:6, 32:36-43). Διαθήκη itself may be absent from 30:1-10, but its broad Moab covenant context (29:1-30:20) gives good reason to believe that the action broadly anticipates the Jeremiah oracle.<sup>68</sup> Deuteronomy 29-30 offers enough pessimism regarding Israel's future to open the door for the anticipated NC,

---

Exodus account, an angel performs the action (Exod 23:20-23). See Dmitri Royster, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 125.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 153-56.

<sup>66</sup> A. Cholewinski, "Zur Theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes," *Bib* 66 (1985): 109-11.

<sup>67</sup> Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 330.

<sup>68</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 184, McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 431-32; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 364; John H. Stek, "'Covenant' Overload in Reformed Theology," *CTJ* 29 Ap (1994): 37-38; M. Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," *ZAW* 88 (1976): 34-35. Marc Zvi Brettler, "Predestination in Deuteronomy 30:1-10," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 171-88 reverses the trajectory, arguing that Deut 30:1-10 is late, and dependent upon Jer 31, not vice-versa.

in some way prefiguring Hebrews' articulation of the necessity for a second διαθήκη (Heb 8:7-8, 10:1-4), a need occasioned in both texts by the ongoing consequences of Israel's sin. Deuteronomy 30:6-10 therefore still exhibits "what may be called new-covenant theology"<sup>69</sup> and Deut 29-30 generally "shares much the same theological position of the new covenant in Jeremiah 31."<sup>70</sup> The primary difference between Deut 30 and Jer 31 – i.e. divine legislative inscription rather than human pedagogy – is also of limited significance for Hebrews. Although Jer 31:33 is cited twice (Heb 8:10; 10:16), the audience's need for teaching remains a fundamental requirement (5:11).<sup>71</sup>

One further observation may be made. As well as being 'new' (8:13, 9:15, 12:24), Hebrews' διαθήκη is also 'second'; it succeeds or replaces the first (10:9). This is somewhat analogous to the Deuteronomic situation in which the Moab covenant assumes pre-eminence, leaving behind the Horeb moment. The narrative structure of Deuteronomy articulates a covenant transfer from one disposition to another and "(w)e should not assume that New Testament writers failed to notice the distinctions between these covenants or viewed them as theologically insignificant."<sup>72</sup>

Whether Moab enhances Horeb or supplants it within covenantal discourse remains disputed within OT scholarship.<sup>73</sup> The potentially disjunctive מלִּבְדִּ/בְּדִּ (29:1/28:69 MT) has caused some to see the Moab covenant as displacing its Horeb predecessor, particularly when introduced by the specific covenantal formulae οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι τῆς διαθήκης.<sup>74</sup> Where Horeb brought forth only the Decalogue, Moab articulated the more substantial covenant stipulations of chapters 5-26. Others have stressed the continuity between the covenants, seeing Moab as an extension,<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 432.

<sup>70</sup> Barker, *Triumph*, 181.

<sup>71</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 392.

<sup>72</sup> Hahn, "Research," 286 – though of covenant diversity in general, not merely Sinai/Moab.

<sup>73</sup> For a review of the various scholarly arguments, see Barker, *Triumph*, 112-16.

<sup>74</sup> Cholewinski, "Moabbundes," 96-111; cf. Horst Dietrich Preuss, *Deuteronomium* (EdF 164; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982), 158: "Hier und nur hier im Alten Testament steht nun Horeb-'Verpflichtung' gegen Moab-'Verpflichtung', d.h. der Dekalog ist die Urkunde des ersteren, das gesamte Dtn. die des zweiten, als Auslegung des Dekalogs, als Entfaltung der Grundgebote." Rofé, "Covenant," 310-20 also stresses the distinction between the two covenants.

<sup>75</sup> Wright, "Deuteronomy (IB)," 502: it is "distinct from – though probably renewing and extending – the original covenant in Horeb."

"renewal,"<sup>76</sup> "supplement"<sup>77</sup> or explication<sup>78</sup> of the Horeb era, a "new Horeb"<sup>79</sup> that imposes no further obligation upon Israel nor negates its content.<sup>80</sup> The absence of any further specific OT mention of the Moab covenant also counts against overstating its distinction from the more prevalent Horeb motif.<sup>81</sup>

Moab falls short of 'replacing' Horeb, and, as we shall subsequently argue, Deuteronomy rhetorically fuses the Moab experience with that of Horeb. Its continuity with Sinai is greater than any discontinuity. Nonetheless, there remains an inherent 'second-ness' to the Moab assembly; the narrative anticipates covenantal progression, not perhaps as acutely as Hebrews' old/new dichotomy, but one in which the Horeb theophany is confined to the past, or relativized, by the Moab discourse. In this sense, the Moab covenant parallels Jer 31, for, narratively at least, it differs from the post-exodus covenant made with Israel's forefathers upon leaving Egypt (Jer 31:32). Olson's suggestion that Moab "decenters" Horeb is thus apposite,<sup>82</sup> with its promissory characterisation and divine agency, the Moab covenant is a second/new/further διαθήκη whose elucidation has consequences for Israel's covenantal experiences at Sinai. If Hebrews was seeking to replicate a narrative juxtaposing two covenants with some degree of tension, Deuteronomy's two covenant discourse would provide a very pertinent precedent.

#### **4.1.4 Conclusion**

We have demonstrated that Hebrews exhibits similar covenantal DNA to Deuteronomy by virtue of its explication of a (new) covenant stipulating faithful obedience to its content. We have also argued that covenant is the key motif used by the respective authors to fulfil their paraenetic purposes. Finally, we have suggested

---

<sup>76</sup> Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 353; McConville, *NIDOTTE* 1:750.

<sup>77</sup> Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 320. Raymond Brown, *The Message of Deuteronomy: Not by Bread Alone* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1993), 15 casts it as a "repetition and more detailed amplification" of Horeb.

<sup>78</sup> Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy*, 160.

<sup>79</sup> McConville and Millar, *Time*, 79; elsewhere Millar inconsistently speaks of Horeb "replacing" Moab – (J. Gary Millar, *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998), 173).

<sup>80</sup> Barker, *Triumph*, 113-14.

<sup>81</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 200.

<sup>82</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 176.

that the Moab covenant of 29:1-30:20 (and particularly 30:1-10) establishes a prior NC akin to Jer 31:31-34, whose 'secondariness' rhetorically prefigures Hebrews' δευτέρα διαθήκη. Whether or not such parallelism is intentional may be beyond proof, but, bearing in mind the other Deuteronomic echoes and allusions we identified in the previous chapter, it is somewhat uncanny how both texts articulate a quasi-covenantal argument to sustain their paraenesis. Hebrews' διαθήκη status becomes even clearer when we turn to its use of blessing and cursing imagery as its mode of exercising covenantal obedience.

## **4.2 Blessing/Cursing Imagery in Hebrews**

We will examine each of Hebrews' five warning passages (2:1-4, 3:7-11, 6:4-8, 10:26-31 and 12:15-17) and examine the function of blessing/cursing imagery within them. For heuristic reasons, we will discuss the passages in the order in which the imagery is key to them, starting with the most prominent examples first.

### **4.2.1 Heb 6:4-8**

Hebrews 6:4-6 has generated heated debate throughout church history,<sup>83</sup> its declaration of the impossibility of repentance problematic for scholars from various theological persuasions.<sup>84</sup> Irrespective of their doctrinal position, however, observers generally fail to take seriously the determinative role of 6:7-8 in understanding the function of 6:4-6. Hebrews 6:7-8 tends to be disregarded as an 'agricultural parable' or supporting illustration, subordinate to the primary argument of 6:4-6. Héring's assessment is perhaps typical: "L'auteur ajoute une parabole destinée non pas à démontrer rigoureusement sa pensée, mais à illustrer."<sup>85</sup> A. B. Bruce advocates an even more extreme (and misplaced) pessimism: "the parable does not really afford us much help to the understanding of the matter."<sup>86</sup> Our contention is that the reverse is

---

<sup>83</sup> Cf. (Robinson, *Epistle*, 75) on 6:4f: "Here we have a passage which, perhaps more than any other, has tended to make the Church feel that this author does not represent the true standard of Christian doctrine."

<sup>84</sup> On the different theological approaches to the pericope, see Gleason, "Hebrews 6:4-8," 69-72; Thomas R. Schreiner and Ardel B. Caneday, *The Race Set before Us: A Biblical Theology of Perseverance and Assurance* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 2001), 21-38.

<sup>85</sup> Héring, *L'Épître*, 61.

<sup>86</sup> A. Bruce, *Epistle*, 214.

true; 6:7-8 is the lens through which 6:4-6 should be read. The illustration may lack the rhetorical polemicism of the preceding verses, but it is actually the skeleton upon which an informed exegesis of 6:4-6 must be formed.

Γὰρ (6:7) is determinative in this regard.<sup>87</sup> The preposition may function either propositionally, articulating the basis upon which prior content is founded, or evidentially, clarifying the grounds upon which the argument has hitherto progressed. Whilst distinguishing between causal and explanatory statements is not always straightforward,<sup>88</sup> one must ascertain whether the weight of the argument falls in either 6:4-6 or 6:7-8. Much scholarship regards γὰρ (6:7) as *de facto* evidential, illustrating or clarifying 6:4-6 with a common agricultural metaphor,<sup>89</sup> one familiar to the audience, but lacking any significant theological or intertextual referent.<sup>90</sup> The imagery, however, whilst familiar, does not accord with contemporary husbandry, where land was burned for renewal, rather than for punitive reasons (6:8). Hebrews also rarely (if ever) uses analogies for parabolic sake alone, without wishing to derive some significance from such usage.<sup>91</sup> It makes more sense, therefore, particularly in view of the LXX/wilderness backdrop to the verses, to understand γὰρ as propositional, i.e. stating the foundational premise upon which the conclusions of 6:4-6 are drawn.<sup>92</sup> The blessing/cursing framework of 6:7-8 is the barometer by which one understands the problematic declarations of 6:4-6.<sup>93</sup>

In an important article on the pericope,<sup>94</sup> David Mathewson observes that 6:4-8 has been hitherto viewed as generally devoid of OT reference, a notable vacuum bearing in mind the overt appeal to Israel's history in 3:7-4:11.<sup>95</sup> Although some scholars have touched upon the function of the LXX in 6:4-6,<sup>96</sup> Mathewson's

---

<sup>87</sup> So rightly Verbrugge, "Towards," 62.

<sup>88</sup> J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954)

<sup>89</sup> Such metaphors have many contemporary parallels. See the comprehensive list in Attridge, *Epistle*, 172.

<sup>90</sup> So Williamson, *Philo*, 241.

<sup>91</sup> Verbrugge, "Towards," 63-64.

<sup>92</sup> Denniston, *Greek*, 60: "γὰρ gives the motive for saying that which has just been said."

<sup>93</sup> Salevao, *Legitimation*, 318-20; Verbrugge, "Towards," 65-66.

<sup>94</sup> Mathewson, "Reading," 209-25.

<sup>95</sup> He cites, for example, the absence of any reference in the comprehensive list of Guthrie, "Old."

<sup>96</sup> Weeks, "Admonition," anticipates some of Mathewson's conclusions, and both Lane, *Hebrews*, 142 and F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 145n38 seem sympathetic to the wilderness typology, albeit without making it

assertion is broadly true, surprisingly so in view of the similar, albeit more overt, wilderness typology in 1 Cor 10:1-10.<sup>97</sup> He redresses this imbalance and draws explicit parallels between the subjects of 6:4-6 and the wilderness generation of Israel. The 'enlightenment' of 6:4a parallels YHWH leading Israel with fire (Neh 9:12, 19), whilst the 'heavenly gift' of 6:4b matches the divine provision of manna (Ex. 16). The partaking of the Holy Spirit finds its equivalent in God's provision of the Spirit (Num 11; cf. Neh 9:20) and the tasting of the word of God mirrors Israel's reception of the word and promise of God (Josh 21:43, 23:14). Finally, the respective blessing/cursing destinies of fruitful and unfruitful land (Heb 6:7-8) replay those same categories elucidated in Deut 11:26-28.<sup>98</sup>

Mathewson's work is broadly convincing; there is much to commend the linking of 3:7-4:11 and 6:4-8, and although hardly the first to suggest their association, he is among the first to do so according to a desert typology. Both sections set before the audience a decision of blessing (rest) or curse (failure to enter in to the rest). Both focus upon the sin of apostasy that would prevent them receiving the blessing.<sup>99</sup> Indeed, Lane suggests that the closest verb to παραπίπτω (6:6) is ἀφίστημι (3:12); both render the same Hebrew root in the LXX (מַעַל) and demonstrate a "deliberate and calculated renunciation of God."<sup>100</sup> Mathewson also observes that the allusion to Deut 11:26-28 (Heb 6:7-8) is the fundamental one that gives substance to the rest. It provides "a compelling case for reading 6:4-6 in the light of the proposed Old Testament background."<sup>101</sup> The reference to the land (γῆ – 6:7) is particularly apposite in recalling the Deuteronomic goal of the promised land

---

the primary interpretative key. Cf. also J. C. McCullough, "The Impossibility of a Second Repentance in Hebrews," *Biblical Theology* 20 (1974): 5: "the background of the author's doctrine of the impossibility of a second repentance is ... to be found in the Old Testament." More recent contributions on the use of the OT in Heb 6:4-8 include Brent Nongbri, "A Touch of Condemnation in a Word of Exhortation: Apocalyptic Language and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric in Hebrews 6:4-12," *NovT* 45 (2003): 265-79; Gleason, "Hebrews 6:4-8," 62-91; Emmrich, "Heb. 6:4-6," 83-95; Verbrugge, "Towards," 61-73.

<sup>97</sup> Note the similarity between ἐβαπτίσθησαν (1 Cor. 10:2) and φωτισθέντας (Heb 6:4), and πνευματικὸν βρῶμα (1 Cor. 10:3) and μετόχους .. πνεύματος ἁγίου (Heb 6:4). See also Johnson, *Hebrews*, 161-62.

<sup>98</sup> Mathewson, "Reading," 215-22.

<sup>99</sup> McKnight, "Warning," 39.

<sup>100</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 142.

<sup>101</sup> Mathewson, "Reading," 222.

(cf. 3:7-19), the very pinnacle of Israel's promised blessing.<sup>102</sup> By viewing 6:4-6 against the wilderness backdrop, "(t)he unfaithfulness of ancient Israel in the wilderness then becomes the paradigm that the addressees must seek to avoid conforming to."<sup>103</sup>

Other non-Deuteronomic texts have been suggested as sources of potential allusion in 6:7-8, but none satisfactorily accounts for the whole picture delineated within Hebrews. Genesis 3:17-18 has often been associated with the pericope, and particularly 6:8.<sup>104</sup> The ground (γῆ) is cursed (ἐπικατάρατος) because of human sin, and will bring forth thorns (ἀκάνθας) and thistles (τριβόλους), clearly evocative of 6:8. However, Gen 3:17-18 lacks any parallel blessing imagery and also articulates a reverse sequence of events; the Genesis curse precedes and occasions the thorns/thistles, but in Heb 6:8, such destructive vegetation actually brings about the curse upon the land.<sup>105</sup> Although absolute precision in allusion is not always necessary for Hebrews (cf. Heb 12:19 and Deut 9:9), such a reversal, coupled with the absence of blessing language, makes the case for an allusion to Gen 3:17-18 less persuasive. It is better viewed as a secondary allusion, its evocation of the Fall narrative illustrative of the significance of apostasy and the seriousness of its consequences.

The mooted allusion to Isa 5:1-7<sup>106</sup> likewise fails to explain the full gamut of Hebrews' reference. Whilst it distinguishes between the anticipated crop of grapes (σταφυλήν) and the actual harvest of thorns (ἀκάνθας),<sup>107</sup> and proclaims a lack of rain (ὑετός) upon the judged vineyard (cf. Heb 6:8), blessing and cursing language is once more notably absent, as is any reference to land (γῆ). The deficiency of the Isaianic source is exemplified by the fact that one of its most vigorous proponents,

---

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Ezek 20:27-28, where παραπίπτω (Heb 6:6) is similarly used of apostasy in the promised land – Leopold Sabourin, "Crucifying Afresh for One's Repentance (Heb 6:4-6)," *BTB* 6 (1976): 266n5.

<sup>103</sup> Emmrich, "Heb. 6:4-6," 86.

<sup>104</sup> Williamson, *Philo*, 234: "There can be little doubt that the Writer of Hebrews, when he was writing 6.7-8, had the Book of Genesis in mind." Spicq, *L'Épître*, 1.332 calls it a "virtuelle citation." See also Hughes, *Commentary*, 223; Hanson, "Hebrews," 292.

<sup>105</sup> Williamson, *Philo*, 239-40; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 229n48.

<sup>106</sup> This is developed most significantly by Verbrugge, "Towards," 61-73, though it receives qualified approval from F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 149 and McCullough, "Isaiah," 166.

<sup>107</sup> MT – עֲנַבִּים (wild grapes).

Verlyn Verbrugge, has to invoke Deut 28-30 to sustain his thesis of a corporate understanding of these verses, without ever really explaining the association between Isa 5 and Deuteronomy.<sup>108</sup> Once more, Isa 5:1-7 is perhaps indicative of the type of agricultural metaphor appealed to for illustrative purposes (akin to the parables of Matt 13:1-43), but is not the primary allusion in Heb 6:7-8.

Deuteronomy 11:11-17, 26-28 (and the subsequent exposition of Deut 28-29) provide the most insightful spectacles through which to understand Heb 6:7-8. The language of Deut 11:26-28 has already figured prominently in the exposition of Ps 95:7-11 in Heb 3:7-19,<sup>109</sup> where the appeal to listen to YHWH (ἐὰν ἀκούσητε – 11:27), to act today (σήμερον – 11:26), rather than be deceived away from God (πλανηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ – 11:28) resonates with similar hortatory appeals in chapter 3. Such common use of Deut 11:26-28 is another reason to link Heb 6:4-8 with 3:7-4:11. The land (γῆ – Deut 11:11; cf. Heb 6:7) drinks rain from heaven (ἐκ τοῦ ὑετοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίνεται ὕδωρ – Deut 11:11; cf. Heb 6:7) such that it produces abundant harvest for Israel (11:14; cf. the efficacious dimension of 6:7 – εὐθετον . . . γεωργεῖται).<sup>110</sup> Similarly, the imagery of 6:8 is evoked by 11:17, where the absence of rain (οὐκ ἔσται ὑετός) brings about a dearth of fruitful crop and ultimately leads to Israel's destruction (ἀπόλλυμι – cf. Heb 10:39, where the fate of the unfaithful is ἀπώλεια). Such 'fruitlessness' is the consequence of apostasy from YHWH (Deut 11:16), a theme replayed in the Deuteronomic allusion of Heb 12:15b (Deut 29:18b).<sup>111</sup> Deuteronomy 11:16 (πρόσεχε . . . παραβῆτε) is vaguely reminiscent of Heb 2:1-2, and also of Heb 3:12-13, where deceitfulness and the heart are linked. But most importantly, the fruitful/unfruitful land dichotomy is described as blessing and cursing (11:26 – εὐλογίαν καὶ κατάραν), the fundamental description applied to the comparison of Heb 6:7-8. Fruitful land is the arena of

---

<sup>108</sup> Verbrugge, "Towards," 71-72.

<sup>109</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 232 views Ps 95 (Heb 3:7-11) as a recontextualisation of Deut 11:26-28. See also Nongbri, "Touch," 271n23.

<sup>110</sup> *Sif. Deut.* 306.19-21, exegeting Deut 32:2 depicts torah in terms of rain showering on the ground to bring growth from the land. Hebrews 6:7 may be alluding to this discourse; at the very least, it is classifying blessing under the NC in the same fashion as the rabbinic tradition did for the (old) torah dispensation.

<sup>111</sup> See 3.2.5.



blessing, unfruitful land is that destined for curse and destruction.<sup>112</sup> The mountains on which blessing and cursing were to be pronounced had respectively associations with fertility (Gerizim) and barrenness (Ebal), making the agricultural symbolism for blessing/curse all the more appropriate.<sup>113</sup>

Deuteronomy 29 also contributes to this melting pot of blessing/cursing imagery.<sup>114</sup> The ultimate fate of the cursed land in 6:8 is burning; elsewhere in the letter, in language borrowed from Deuteronomy (Deut 4:24, 9:3; cf. Heb 12:29), burning evokes judgment (10:27; 12:29) and the same sense is probable here. Rather than any attempt at 'renewal' of the soil's fertility, the burning of the land is punitive and destructive. We have already seen the use of Deut 29:18-19 in Heb 12:15 and will argue below for similar usage of 29:20-21 in 12:16-17. The context of the discourse is apostasy from the covenant (Deut 29:18-19; cf. Heb 12:15) and the curse that such action occasions (29:21). For the next generation, the fundamental proof of YHWH's judgment upon Israel is the devastation of the land (Deut 29:22); it will be burned up (κατακαυμένον – 29:23; cf. Heb 6:8) on account of Israel's rejection of YHWH's covenant with her.

In summary, Deuteronomy prefigures Heb 6:7-8's references to blessing, cursing, rain, land, drinking, produce, burning and fruitlessness (if not thorns and thistles), a count unmatched by either Gen 3:17-18 or Isa 5:11-7. This is further evidence of Deuteronomy and Hebrews' shared covenantal perspective; blessing and cursing language, linked to the evidential fertility of the land, is used to ground obedience to (and apostasy from) both the old and new covenants.<sup>115</sup>

This perspective, however, is not universally shared. Scott Hahn, for example, affirms the strong Deuteronomic perspective to Heb 6:1-7, but interprets the interrelationship somewhat differently. He reads the appeal to covenant curses as referring back to the inability of the old covenant to deal with sin; they primarily evoke the old dispensation, and have no referent to life under the NC.

---

<sup>112</sup> John Chrysostom understands 6:8 as consolation, since ἐγγύς (6:8) implies a way out from cursing/judgment; i.e. it is only 'near', it has not yet come (*Hom. Heb.* 10.3). See also Royster, *Epistle*, 90-91.

<sup>113</sup> Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 217-18.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Dunnill, *Covenant*, 131.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Lane, *Hebrews*, 143: "the motif of blessing and cursing places the discussion firmly in a covenantal context."

The warning expressed does not reflect any weakness with the New Covenant; on the contrary, it simply drives home the author's point: the Old Covenant is manifestly ineffectual in averting the curses of the Old Covenant, from Adam under the angels to the time of Israel in the wilderness under Moses and Aaron, just as it cannot secure or transmit the promised blessings.<sup>116</sup>

His interpretation, however, sits ill with the letter's overall argument. The context of 6:4-8 is apostasy from the (NC) community, not a discourse upon the old. The warning is orientated to NC praxis and ongoing faithfulness (6:1-3), rather than to indict the old covenant for its inability to deal with sin. The parallelism of 6:7-8 also requires that both verses speak to the same situation; depending on the response to that situation, the 'reward' is either blessing or curse.<sup>117</sup> Vanhoye concurs with this structural assessment. He describes 6:7-8 as "un spécimen à deux branches" and outlines its logic as follows:

**6:7** (A) ground that drinks the rain which often falls upon it

(B) and brings forth vegetation useful to those for whose sake it is also tilled

(C) receives a blessing from God;

**6:8** (B) but yields thorns and thistles,

(C) is worthless and close to being cursed, and it ends up being burned.<sup>118</sup>

Such logic underscores how Hebrews conceives of only one starting point (A), namely exposure to the NC community. From this one situation, two mutually exclusive outcomes are delineated (B), whose respective fates (C) represent blessing/cursing categories. As Dods summarizes, "the subject is the same, the results are different."<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Hahn, "Kinship", 549. Swetnam, "Hebrews 9:15-18," 381-86 similarly limits curse language to the first covenant. This is true for Gal 3:6-14 (as Hahn, "Kinship", 480 rightly notes), but not of Heb 6:7-8.

<sup>117</sup> Implicit in David A. deSilva, "Exchanging Favor for Wrath: Apostasy in Hebrews and Patron-Client Relationships," *JBL* 115 (1996): 112-13.

<sup>118</sup> Albert Vanhoye, "Héb 6:7-8 et le Mashal Rabbinique," in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke* (ed. William C. Weinrich; Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1984), 527-32.

<sup>119</sup> Dods et al., *Greek*, 299; see also Origen, *Princ.* 3.1.10.

Hahn's approach blurs the distinction between the epistle's paraenetic and doctrinal strands. In the latter, the old covenant is certainly laid to rest by the christologically-inaugurated NC, but the hortatory passages retain the old covenantal categories and use them as the raw material for requiring obedience to the NC dispensation. The covenant's content may be new, but appeal to its proper observance remains very much grounded in the quintessentially Deuteronomic categories of blessing and cursing.<sup>120</sup> Just as Moses set before Israel blessing and curses, life and death, so Hebrews sets before his audience a similar choice between two antithetical options: will they continue to embrace the NC dispensation and its associated rewards (6:7; cf. 12:1-3, 12-13), or will they drift away (cf. 2:1, 10:39) and receive the cursing that ultimately ends in judgment (6:8: cf. 10:30-31)?<sup>121</sup>

The antithetical dualism continues in Heb 6:9-12. Hebrews encourages its audience to embrace the 'better things' of salvation (6:9); God will reward them for their diligence and hard work (6:10-11).<sup>122</sup> On the other hand, in tones albeit more moderate than 6:8, they are not to become lazy (6:12) and risk missing out on the promised inheritance. But if the blessing/cursing dualism of 6:7-8 is the propositional basis for 6:4-6, then it should come as no surprise that the dualism is equally implicit in 6:4-6 itself. Of the five participles, the middle three are mutually parallel, each speaking to the blessings and manifestations of the heavenly age ushered in by Christ.<sup>123</sup> This is not to deny that tasting the heavenly gift, or being partakers of the Holy Spirit are unconnected to the reception of salvation (cf. Heb 2:4, where they seem somewhat intertwined), but rather to assign a particular significance to φωτισθέντας, partly because of its primary position, partly because of its similar use in 10:32. The analogy is not absolutely precise, but one senses that the γευσσάμενους-γεννηθέντας-γευσσάμενους clauses are evidential, supporting the more

---

<sup>120</sup> Blessing/cursing imagery appears elsewhere in the LXX (cf. Lev. 26:1-46), but not so avowedly part of the text's structure and intrinsically allied with covenantal obligation. The apposition of blessing and cursing in Sir 3:9, Mal 2:2 lacks the covenantal dichotomy, whilst the cursing of Jer 11:1-17 lacks a blessing counterpart. Only in Deuteronomy is blessing and cursing integrally related to the covenantal exposition and scenario of the text.

<sup>121</sup> Gleason, "Hebrews 6:4-8," 86-90 arrives at a similar conclusion, but does not see it as so overtly Deuteronomic.

<sup>122</sup> Vanhoye, "Héb 6:7-8," 530-31 notes that 6:7 and 6:10 are linked by God's action of blessing.

<sup>123</sup> This is only implicit, but is stylistically suggested by φωτισθέντας and παραπεσόντας lacking an object; cf. Lane, *Hebrews*, 141: "What is denoted by ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας is described more fully by the clauses that follow."

objective assertion of φωτισθέντας. The first and fifth participles both function as 'bookends', but as bookends that are antonymous and mutually exclusive.<sup>124</sup>

Although it later earned that association, ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας (6:4) is not the mark of baptism,<sup>125</sup> but rather the point of the conversion at which the faithful embrace the promise of the σωτηρία and become partakers of the new order (cf. 10:32).<sup>126</sup> Conversely, παραπίπτω is the point at which they reject the once-for-all sacrifice and exit themselves from the covenantal relationship. Repentance is ἀδύνατος not because of its *theoretical* impossibility, but because of its *functional* dimension.<sup>127</sup> Hebrews 6:4 and 6:6 therefore set forth a simple choice between two competing options: the way of faithfulness/blessing (φωτισθέντας) or the way of apostasy/cursing (παραπεσόντας).<sup>128</sup> In both Hebrews and Deuteronomy, two inherently polar opposites are laid out – one of blessing, the other of curse. There is "no middle ground for the sluggish and disobedient."<sup>129</sup>

When Heb 6:4-8 is seen as reflective of Deuteronomic decision, problematic issues of doctrinal correctness and eternal security are replaced by hortatory appeals for continued community participation and against apostasy.<sup>130</sup> Such appeals negate

---

<sup>124</sup> Another way of assessing the hierarchy of the discourse is to suggest that φωτισθέντας and παραπεσόντας are the primary participles, respectively modified by γευσσάμενους/γεννηθέντας/γευσσάμενους and ἀνασταυρούντας/παραδειγματίζοντας.

<sup>125</sup> Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 108.

<sup>126</sup> This correlates with the assessment of Löhr, *Umkehr*, 287 that μετάνοια has reference to the beginnings of the audience's Christian experience, and suggests a close association between μετάνοια and φωτισθέντας. Whilst the former should not be translated as conversion ('*Bekehrung*'), the impossibility of a second repentance is allied to the inability to return to that initial moment of enlightenment or conversion.

<sup>127</sup> The impossibility of repentance seems also inextricably linked to Hebrews' articulation of the (ἐφ)ἅπαξ sacrifice of Christ; as the latter is the only way of dealing with sin, those who reject its very foundational status can never, by definition, be brought back to repentance. See Salevao, *Legitimation*, 282-90.

<sup>128</sup> Craddock, "New," 78 comes close to emphasizing the dualism: "it is only when coming to faith in Christ is experienced as receiving all the gifts of God listed in vv4-5 that 'falling away' can be seen in all its ugliness and danger."

<sup>129</sup> Peterson, *Hebrews*, 183. Cf. Wright, *Deuteronomy (NIBC)*, 153: "obedience or disobedience is the only choice, blessing or curse the only prospect."

<sup>130</sup> Steven D. Fraade, "Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and the Curses," *DSD* 10 (2003): 155-59 finds a similar dualistic, community defining, us/them aspect to the blessing/curses in 1QS 1:16-2:18. Within the annual covenant renewal ceremony 'curses of the Covenant' are levied against the apostate who pursues idols and turns away from YHWH. The context is explicitly Deut 29:18-20 (itself alluded to Heb 12:15-17, whose blessing imagery we discuss in the next section), and the fate of the apostate is 'eternal destruction' (1QS2.15).

"addressing to this text (i.e Heb 6:4-6) questions with which the author was not directly concerned."<sup>131</sup> Within Deuteronomy, blessing/cursing language, whilst covenantal in origin, serves primarily a paraenetic exhortation to obedience rather than espousing binding doctrine or articulating soteriological dogma. Covenantal obedience and loyalty, not soteriology, are the Deuteronomic terms of thought, and these seem to be the same categories adopted by Heb 6:4-8.

#### **4.2.2 Heb 12:16-17**

The inclusion of Heb 12:16-17 within a discussion of Deuteronomy's contribution to Hebrews may initially seem a rather odd suggestion.<sup>132</sup> The verses appeal to the events of Gen 25:29-34 and 27:30-40, respectively Esau's rejection of his birthright (12:16) and his subsequent inability to regain the primogenital blessing (12:17).<sup>133</sup> The Genesis-Esau narrative, however, though not insignificant, is subjugated to the paraenetic purpose of the pericope; no mention is made, for example, of Jacob's trickery (an integral part of the Genesis plot) and the impossibility of repentance is "something which is not even implicit in the OT story."<sup>134</sup> It is our contention, that 12:16-17 extends the Deuteronomic backdrop of Heb 12:15; although he does not significantly discuss the pericope's Deuteronomic context, we concur with Salevao's contention that "once again, the covenantal structure of obedience/blessing or apostasy/curse ... (has) been adopted by the author of Hebrews to express the dilemma confronting his readers."<sup>135</sup>

The description of Esau as both πόρνος and βέβηλος<sup>136</sup> (12:16) is problematic. Βέβηλος is consistent with his preference for physical satisfaction

---

<sup>131</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 325. Cf. also A. H. Snyman, "Hebrews 6:4-6: From a Semiotic Discourse Perspective," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches & Results* (ed. Jeffrey T. Reed and Stanley E. Porter; JSNTSup 170; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 364-68.

<sup>132</sup> Bearing in mind the strong Deuteronomic reference to 12:15, both Lane, *Hebrews*, 454 and Katz, "Quotations," 214 specifically remark upon its absence in 12:16-17.

<sup>133</sup> Hebrews, however, reads the story beyond the Genesis testimony. Genesis links the two events, but does not causatively associate them; in Heb 12:16-17, they are seen as sequential, perhaps even consequential.

<sup>134</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 669.

<sup>135</sup> Salevao, *Legitimation*, 323.

<sup>136</sup> Along with most commentators, we do not find persuasive the suggestion that only βέβηλος pertains to Esau. BDF §446 classifies ἦ as predominantly copulative, rather than disjunctive. For the opposing view, cf. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 407.

rather than spiritual blessing<sup>137</sup> (cf. Lev 10:10; 1 Tim 1:9), especially as the adjective has cultic connotation and is used antithetically with notions of holiness (1 Sam 21:5; 3 Macc 2:2, 14). Holiness is the blessing accorded to those who are faithful (Heb 12:14), and Esau's βέβηλος designation places him in stark contrast to those who obediently seek after God's blessing (12:14).

His depiction as πόρνος is less straightforward. Its customary rendering as 'fornicator' lacks any obvious LXX referent and, whilst it perhaps refers to his marriage outside of Israel (Gen 26:32), it more probably derives from haggadic intertestamental tradition, especially within Philo and Jubilees.<sup>138</sup> Although other NT usage of πόρνος concurs with the notion of fornicators defiling community purity (1 Cor 5:9-11; 1 Tim 1:9-10; cf. Heb 12:15b), the covenantal context of 12:18-24, coupled with the prior warning against apostasy (12:15a), make it more likely that πόρνος denotes here 'spiritual,' rather than 'physical,' fornication.<sup>139</sup> Esau's rejection of his birthright was tantamount to spiritual prostitution and *de facto* idolatry. Although sexual immorality is of interest elsewhere in the letter (13:4), apostasy, rather than physicality, is the dominant heuristic motif in 12:16-17.<sup>140</sup>

Hebrews 12:17 has its own exegetical issues, specifically the meaning of μετάνοια and the referent of αὐτήν. On the first question, 'repentance' is probably the best translation of μετάνοια (so NASB, NRSV). Although the more secular 'change of mind' (NIV, ASV, REB)<sup>141</sup> follows Gen 27:34 more closely and emphasizes Esau's futile efforts to alter Isaac's decision, we will argue below that Hebrews is more concerned with covenantal or Deuteronomic significance than with a like-for-like restatement of the narrative.<sup>142</sup> The judicial context of 'change of mind' (cf. the Latin *locus poenitentiae*, commonly cited as a parallel to τόπος

---

<sup>137</sup> Thompson, *Beginnings*, 43-44 sees Esau's choice as between earthly and spiritual blessing; i.e. the audience is not to be 'worldly' like Esau. However, the choice before Esau (and, by extension, the audience) is between blessing and no blessing at all, or rather between blessing and curse.

<sup>138</sup> *Virt.* 208-210; *Leg.* 3.2; *QG* 4.201; *Jub.* 25:1. Williamson, *Philo*, 267 concedes that Hebrews shared similar views on Esau as Philo, but "the evidence for the influence of Philo's treatment of Esau in the Epistle to the Hebrews is very slight indeed." For a comprehensive review of the haggadic tradition, see Löhr, *Umkehr*, 123-29.

<sup>139</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 369.

<sup>140</sup> So Casey, "Eschatology", 124.

<sup>141</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.402; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 225-26.

<sup>142</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 370: "As is frequently the case in Hebrews' handling of biblical stories, the paraenetic point, not the original plot, is determinative."

μετανοίας) also does not help, as it is always used of a subject changing his own mind, not that of a third party.<sup>143</sup> Μετάνοια should be instead rendered as 'repentance', consistent with its usage elsewhere in the letter (6:1, 6:6) and contributing to the thematic parallel between 6:4-8 and 12:15-17 (the impossibility of repentance for the apostate).

The issue of the referent of αὐτήν is less conclusive, and commentators divide on whether it relates to blessing<sup>144</sup> or repentance.<sup>145</sup> Gender and contextual affinity with Genesis 27 make εὐλογίαν a pertinent option, but the proximity of μετανοίας τόπον, coupled with the search/find contrast, makes the case for repentance equally persuasive. It is conceivable that the feminine αὐτήν reflects the gender of μετανοίας rather than masculine τόπον, the syntactically correct referent. Either alternative is possible and commentators divide equally on the options.

In view of such inconclusiveness, however, one wonders whether a choice between the two possibilities must, or indeed *should*, be made. Rather than being competing exegetical options, 'repentance' and 'blessing' are part of the same package; they are not synonymous, but within Hebrews' dualistic mindset, both are grouped together under the eschatological/Christ dispensation. Hagner concludes along similar lines: "the difference (i.e. between blessing and repentance)...is only slight since the 'repentance' was after all designed to repossess the blessing. Futility in one meant futility in the other and either could have been the source of Esau's anguish."<sup>146</sup> As such, 'repentance' becomes a *de facto* blessing, akin to the eschatological blessings elucidated in 6:4-5.<sup>147</sup> It stands in opposition to apostasy

---

<sup>143</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 440.

<sup>144</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 440t; F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 351; Koester, *Hebrews*, 533; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 409; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 226; McCullough, "Impossibility," 4; Marshall, *Kept*, 150.

<sup>145</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 370; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.402, Michel, *Brief*, 457-58; Windisch, *Hebräerbrief*, 112-13, Ernst Käsemann, "Hebräer 12,12-17," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 309n2; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 668, Moffatt, *Commentary*, 212; Braun, *Hebräer*, 429; Casey, "Eschatology", 146.

<sup>146</sup> Donald A. Hagner, *Hebrews: Based on the New International Version* (NIBCNT 14; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995).

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Käsemann, "Hebräer," 309: 'im ganzen NT μετάνοια – Umkehr – Zeichen der eschatologischen Zeit ist....In solchem Sinne kann man umkehren nur, wenn und solange Gott Gnade gibt.'

(cf. παραπεσόντας – 6:6), has a telic sense to it (εἰς μετάνοιαν – 6:6) and is 'away from' works that lead to death (ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων – 6:1).<sup>148</sup>

This close association between blessing and repentance echoes their parallelism in Heb 6:4-8, the pericope with which 12:15-17 appears closely allied. We follow Carlston's maxim as to the author's hermeneutic, that he is assumed to be consistent unless proved otherwise,<sup>149</sup> and there is much 'consistency' between the respective paragraphs.<sup>150</sup> Thematically, both appeal to the impossibility of repentance post-apostasy. Linguistically, both classify the 'positive' goal as blessing for the individual concerned. Rhetorically, both appeal to a backdrop rooted within the Israelite story. Most significantly, both elucidate the fatal consequences of apostasy; the rhetorical effect of the triple use of ἀπο– terms (12:15 – ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος; 12:16 – ἀπέδετο; 12:17 – ἀπεδοκιμάσθη) seems to be more than accidental in portraying the movement away from YHWH and the community. In particular, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη is strongly reminiscent of ἄδοκιμος (6:8),<sup>151</sup> thereby aligning Esau's fate with the cursed destiny of the thorn-infested ground. Indeed, if one reads 12:16-17 as explicating the concept of the 'bitter root' of 12:15, then both pericopes also share an appeal to horticultural development for their argument.<sup>152</sup> If 6:4-6 outlines the theoretical case of the impossibility of bringing someone back to repentance, 12:15-17 demonstrates its real, practical manifestation.

The immediate context of the Esau exemplar is the pernicious effect of an apostate individual upon the rest of the community (12:15). Within 12:15, we have identified an allusion to Deut 29:18, based partly upon the 'root of bitterness' (ρίζα

---

<sup>148</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 314 tentatively proposes that μετάνοιαν . . . ἔργων (6:1) echoes Deut 30:15, 18, imitating the life/death proposal Moses placed before Israel. This is an attractive suggestion. Deuteronomy 30:19 sets blessing/curse and life/death in apposition, bringing together the two dualisms mentioned in 30:1 and 30:15-6, both of which share 'setting before' language (ἔδωκα πρὸ προσώπου). Life/death and blessing/curse were alternative ways of laying the choice before Israel, either to follow the path of covenantal obedience, or to fall prey to idolatry and apostasy. It would seem, therefore, that Hebrews replicates this life/death choice through its usage of blessing/cursing imagery, and places 'repentance' alongside life/blessing. Esau chose the apostate path and that precluded his access to a second repentance and its associated divine blessing (Heb 12:17).

<sup>149</sup> Carlston, "Eschatology," 296.

<sup>150</sup> McKnight, "Warning," 21-59.

<sup>151</sup> Käsemann, "Hebräer," 308; Lane, *Hebrews*, 457; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 212; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.402.

<sup>152</sup> Moffatt, *Commentary*, 212.



πικρίας), partly upon replication of the μή τις construction.<sup>153</sup> As a third μή τις is found in Heb 12:16, "clearly fashioned to suit" the first two,<sup>154</sup> there is contextual and structural grounds to believe that 12:16-17 be linked to 12:15 in terms of the sin committed (apostasy) and of the continued application of the Deut 29:18-20 material. The apostate individual of 29:18a who is described as the bitter root of 29:18b (the two texts replayed in Heb 12:15) is classified in Deut 29:19 as hearing a curse (ἄρά). This curse is brought upon the one who boasts in – or blesses<sup>155</sup> – him/herself. This individual assumes for themselves the very holiness that is the divinely given goal of the believer in Heb 12:14. The description of Esau as βέβηλος seems entirely consistent with such idolatrous practice; partial precedent may be found in the depiction of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is described as both a 'sinful root' (ρίζα ἁμαρτωλὸς – 1 Macc 1:10; cf. Heb 12:15) and βέβηλος (3 Macc 2:2, 2:14). As these same characteristics are attributed in 12:15 and 12:16, it seems probable that the 'bitter root' of 12:15 is the same individual as that of 12:16 (i.e. Esau), just as the apostate individual of Deut 29:19 is probably the idolatrous ῥίζα of 29:18.<sup>156</sup>

The main factor linking Deut 29:18-20 and Heb 12:15-17 remains the common absence of forgiveness for the apostate. The emphatic οὐ μή demonstrates that YHWH will not forgive the apostate individual (cf. Heb 12:17), and instead an abundance of curses will fall upon him. Although Deut 29:20 emphasizes the lack of divine forgiveness (as opposed to the repentance or otherwise of the apostate), the comparison with Heb 12:17 is still valid, since Esau shows all the signs of one who is genuinely repentant (μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας). Hebrews' contention is that repentance is not possible in such circumstances – there is no *ground* for it; one assumes because God wills it so. The summation of such evidence leads us to the conclusion that Esau becomes cast in the clothing of Deut 29:19, as the one whose apostasy and (spiritual) infidelity denies him a place of repentance, removes him from divine blessing and exposes him to the covenantal cursing. In short, for Hebrews, Esau is the embodiment of the apostate individual of Deut 29:18.

---

<sup>153</sup> See 3.2.5.

<sup>154</sup> Katz, "Quotations," 214.

<sup>155</sup> MT – בָּרַךְ (bless).

<sup>156</sup> There is also a possible association between the bitter root (ρίζα πικρίας) and Esau's bitter cry upon discovering Jacob has stolen his blessing (φωνήν μεγάλην καὶ πικράν – Gen 27:34).

It may be objected that the 'blessing' sought in 12:17 pertains to the 'promise' of the forefathers, and belongs to that paradigm, rather than any Deuteronomic dialectic of obedience/apostasy. This is certainly the case for Genesis, but, as we observed above, the author is less interested in the precise detail of the Esau narrative than in exploiting its heuristic potential for warning against apostasy. The three-fold μή τις structure of Heb 12:15-16, the thematic parallels with Deut 29:18-23, the consistencies with Heb 6:4-8 and the dualism between blessing and rejection all suggest that the author has translated Esau from the Genesis context and recast his εὐλογία, perhaps *gezera shawa* style, within the Deuteronomic covenant situation. The 'blessing' Esau receives (Gen. 27:38-40; cf. Heb 11:20) is actually the inverse – a curse – and denies him access to any grounds for repentance.<sup>157</sup> In Heb 12:16-17, even this token blessing is denied him.

The culmination of the blessing/cursing discourse – the real, practical example of Esau – is succeeded by the two mountains comparison of Sinai/Zion. The shift between 12:17 and 12:18 can be seen as awkward; although the pericopes share a common appeal to the rights of the πρωτότοκος, this does not appear until 12:23, and then only in a sequence of other Zion participants. The relationship between 12:17 and 12:18 is far smoother if Sinai/Zion is viewed as an echo or representation of the blessing/cursing pairing of Mounts Ebal/Gerizim in Deut 11 and 27.<sup>158</sup> Although the order is reversed, and there is more to the Sinai/Zion comparison than merely reflecting the blessing/cursing dualism, Hebrews appears to use the two mountains motif to recreate the blessing/cursing montage of Deut 11 and 27-28, the same passages that sourced the allusion in 6:7-8. Sinai becomes the mountain of cursing, the NC equivalent of Mount Ebal; Zion similarly becomes the locus of blessing, the NC Gerizim.

The depiction of the mountains as the respective symbols of blessing/cursing also signifies the nature of the blessing/curse in 12:15-17. Esau's πρωτοτόκια (12:16) recalls the entry of the first-born Son (πρωτότοκος) into the heavenly οἰκουμένη (1:6), used typologically for the land of Canaan. Zion – the mount of

---

<sup>157</sup> Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 181.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 119: "Gerizim and Ebal were eventually not simply geographical locations, but symbolic terms for 'blessing' and 'cursing' in the liturgical context, whether at Shechem, Gilgal or elsewhere." Horst Seebass, "Garizim und Ebal als Symbole von Segen und Fluch," *Bib* 63 (1982): 22-31 proposes that Gerizim and Ebal become the loci, rather than the foci, of the blessing/cursing in Deut 27.

blessing – is the locus of the assembly of the first-born (ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων – 12:23), and in view of the proximity to 12:16-17, it is difficult to believe that an association between 12:16 and 12:23, premised upon the notion of πρωτοτόκια, was not in the author's mind at this point.<sup>159</sup> Assuming this association, it follows that membership of the πρωτοτόκια is that which is denied Esau because of his actions,<sup>160</sup> and consequently, the blessing is participation in the heavenly assembly, the new covenantal people of God (12:22-23), within the 'Land' (cf. 1:6). This goal accords with Deut 29 where the covenantal benefit is, likewise, implicitly continued membership of the landed covenant people of God. Conversely, to be apostate – to be the recipient of the curse – is to be denied entry into the land and the community of Israel, reversing the imagery of 1:6 (cf. 3:7-19).

#### **4.2.3 – Heb 10:26-31**

Hebrews 10:26-31 develops the themes of 6:4-8,<sup>161</sup> especially the fiery destiny of the apostate individual<sup>162</sup> who scorns the watershed death of Christ (6:8, 10:27). We should not be surprised therefore to find covenantal blessing/cursing imagery on its horizon. Moreover, in view of the pericope's frequent Deuteronomic citation (10:28, 10:30a, 10:30b), it would be equally unsurprising if covenantal appeal is administered through the same blessing/cursing categories that Deuteronomy itself utilizes. The judgment of 10:27 is Deuteronomic judgment (10:30b: cf. Deut 32:36) and, although blessing and cursing terminology is not specifically used, it functions within a covenantal context.<sup>163</sup> Such a context is manifest by the apostate's contempt for the αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης (10:29), and in relation to the verbal actions of 10:29, Attridge rightly observes: "these clauses do not specify particular sinful actions, but

---

<sup>159</sup> The association between 1:6, 12:16 and 12:23 is strongly argued in Helyer, "Prototokos," 15-16. See also Lane, *Hebrews*, 468-69.

<sup>160</sup> Casey, "Eschatology", 364.

<sup>161</sup> On the similarities between the pericopes, see Salevao, *Legitimation*, 320-21. Where 6:4-6 stresses the impossibility of restoring apostates to repentance, 10:26 likewise posits their lack of efficacious sacrifice for sin.

<sup>162</sup> The sin of 10:26 is most likely apostasy (cf. 10:25 - certain individuals are absenting themselves from the congregation). Lane, *Hebrews*, 292 equates the action of 10:26 with 3:12; it "connotes a conscious expression of an attitude that displays contempt for God."

<sup>163</sup> Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 178-79.

rather characterize, in vivid metaphors, the repudiation of the new covenant."<sup>164</sup> Likewise, Hillers moots the possibility that profaning the blood of the covenant is "a distant echo of the old conception in which the covenant partner brought a conditional *curse* on himself through the 'blood of the covenant.'"<sup>165</sup> Whilst 10:26-31 lacks the acute dualism of 6:4-8 or 12:15-17, the blessing element is still implicit; exposure to the spirit of grace (10:29), sanctification (10:29) and benefit from sacrifice for sin (10:26) may all be seen as covenantal 'blessings.'

Beyond this covenantal context, 10:26-31 also has affinities with the cursing language of Deut 28-29. Of particular interest is the emphatically *fearful* (φοβέω-) characterisation of the climax of the curses in Deut 28:58-68; whereas blessing meant the nations would fear Israel (28:10), cursed Israel fears day and night (φοβέω – 28:66-67) in their state of exile. The threefold use of φοβ- forms in 28:66-67 resonates with the φοβερός emphasis of 10:27 and 10:31; the living God (θεοῦ ζῶντος- 10:31; potentially, a genitive of source, the 'god of life') will be the one who causes Israel to doubt their very life (Deut 28:66). Likewise, the jealous fire (πυρὸς ζήλος – 10:27) parallels Deut 29:20 LXX (ἐκκαυθήσεται ὀργή κυρίου καὶ ὁ ζήλος αὐτοῦ), the pericope which we argued formed a source for blessing/cursing imagery in 12:15-17. The scale of destruction anticipated for the apostate of 29:20-21, and its irrevocability, are of a similar harshness to that of Heb 10:26-31.

#### **4.2.4 – Heb 2:1-4**

Covenantal curses form part of the author's thinking in 2:2; if the message delivered by angels is the Sinai covenant (cf. Deut 33:2), then every παράβασις καὶ παρακοή (2:2) invokes the punishment outlined in the Deuteronomic curses. Pfizner surmises: "what angels once revealed had built in sanctions and warnings, blessings and curses."<sup>166</sup> Since the *a fortiori* comparison is made with such curses (2:2-3), covenantal curse presumably remains the category of punishment – albeit far worse – within the NC dispensation.

---

<sup>164</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 294.

<sup>165</sup> Hillers, *Covenant*, 182, my emphasis.

<sup>166</sup> Pfizner, *Hebrews*, 58.

As with 10:26-31, corresponding blessing language is more implicit, though it is perhaps invited by the μισθαποδοσία reference (2:2).<sup>167</sup> Although it pertains here primarily to cursing, following Pfitzner, its 'reward' sense may equally invoke the blessings that likewise accompanied angelic mediation. The fourfold divine witness (2:4) may therefore be viewed as carrying 'blessing' connotation. In particular, σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν may remind the audience of the blessing of the exodus event, since the LXX almost invariably uses the phrase in that context (Deut 4:34, 6:22, 7:19 *inter alia*).<sup>168</sup> The divine testimonies are also analogous to the blessings of 6:4-5; ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν (2:4) parallels δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος (6:5) and there is a similar correspondence between πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς (2:4) and ετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου (6:5). Following this reasoning, 2:1-4 sets a choice before the audience, either to continue to embrace the blessings of the divinely testified σωτηρία, or to ignore them and face the inescapable consequences of Deuteronomic-type curses.

#### **4.2.5 – Heb 3:7-4:11**

In linguistic terms at least, blessing/cursing imagery appears less prevalent in 3:7-4:11. Dunnill, however, still ascribes the dichotomy to Heb 4:1-12,<sup>169</sup> and Buchanan classifies the oath of 3:11 (Ps. 94:11 LXX) that denies Israel access to the divine rest under the criteria of cursing.<sup>170</sup> If, following Mathewson, Heb 6:4-8 sustains the wilderness apostasy of 3:7-4:11, then it is at least *possible* that the latter passage prefigures in some way the blessing/cursing imagery of 6:4-8. Without presuming a complete definition of κατὰπαυσις, it is surely, at the very least, a blessing – perhaps the ultimate blessing in that it is the same Sabbath blessing (σαββατισμὸς) God himself enjoys. Conversely, the wilderness generation's apostasy (3:12) and subsequent 'falling' (πίπτω – 3:17) in the desert has associations with the apostate action of 6:6 (παρὰπίπτω), whose cursed fate is destined for burning. Gleason

---

<sup>167</sup> Cf. 11:6: God is also a 'rewarder' (μισθαποδότης) of those who seek him, possibly suggesting a blessing of those who are faithful to the covenant.

<sup>168</sup> The climax of the Deuteronomic curses promises a return to Egypt, an anti-exodus, in effect a negation of the salvation episode that marks Israel's existence: see Peter M. Head, "The Curse of Covenant Reversal: Deuteronomy 28:58-68 and Israel's Exile," *Chm* 111 (1997): 218-26.

<sup>169</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 133 classifies 4:1ff under blessing, and 4:12 under curse.

<sup>170</sup> Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 62-64.

concludes in relation to the pericope: "(f)ollowing the Old Testament pattern, the New Covenant includes stipulations assuring the covenantal blessings. The forfeiture of rest in Hebrews corresponds to the covenantal consequences for failing to fulfil the stipulations of the New Covenant order."<sup>171</sup> There is also the teasing possibility that ἄρα (4:9), clearly here the inferential particle (cf. 12:8), rhetorically echoes ἄρα as 'curse' (cf. Rom. 3:14), the same word used for curse in Deut 29:14, 19-20 (cf. Heb 12:15-17). Such rhetorical usage would set curse (ἄρα) and blessing (σαββατισμὸς) in close proximity, and one wonders if this was somehow at the back of the author's mind. Perhaps 4:11 best captures the blessing/cursing decision, suitably so in view of its climactic point in the pericope. It exhorts the audience to strive to enter into the rest (blessing), lest (and one assumes an either/or decision) they fall by the same example of apostasy (curse).

#### **4.2.6 Blessing & Cursing: Summary**

We have seen the use of Deuteronomic blessing and cursing categories as the means by which Hebrews articulates a fundamental either/or choice before its NC audience. The language is most explicit in 6:4-8 and 12:15-17, but the imagery and dialectic extend to the other warning passages in order to articulate the same, core choice. Blessing is the way of obedience and repentance, whilst cursing is that of apostasy and death.

### **4.3 Deuteronomy/Hebrews and the Land**

#### **4.3.1 Introduction: Deuteronomy and the Land**

Von Rad observes that Deuteronomy "depicts the nation's *hic et nunc* in the land of Canaan as the state of salvation. ... The land is undeniably the most important factor in the state of redemption to which Israel has been brought."<sup>172</sup> Miller similarly ascribes quasi-soteriological status to Canaan, proposing: "(p)ossession of the land

---

<sup>171</sup> Gleason, "Rest," 303.

<sup>172</sup> Gerhard von Rad, "There Still Remains a Sabbath Rest for the People of God," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966), 94-95. He further suggests Deuteronomy "has spoken of this land of Canaan almost as if it were a paradise" – Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 93.

and life in it are ... the gift of salvation."<sup>173</sup> Entry into the land – or rather failure so to do – provides an inclusio for the whole text;<sup>174</sup> life in Canaan is the context for the law code of chapters 12-26, and the paraenetic exhortation of 5-11 casts the gift in terms of covenantal obedience and faithfulness. Land is central to the whole book. It is described as both Israel's 'rest' (3:20, 5:33, 12:9-10, 25:19) and their 'inheritance' (4:21, 12:9, 15:4, 19:3, 19:10, 26:1),<sup>175</sup> graciously given by God; its locale has both physical and spiritual dimensions.<sup>176</sup> As the cities, the homes and the vegetation are all given to Israel (cf. Deut 6:10-11),<sup>177</sup> Von Rad contends that the land motif should not be spiritualized; life in Canaan was "an altogether tangible peace granted to a nation plagued by enemies and weary of wandering."<sup>178</sup>

The Deuteronomic perspective also depicts the land gift as the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham (1:8, 6:10, 9:5, 30:20, 31:21 LXX, 34:4). The land is the primary sense in which the forefathers are remembered, bringing both closure to, and continuity with, the patriarchal narrative. In Deuteronomy, the Abraham land promise and the Horeb/Moab covenants fuse together; the land is given to both Abraham (vicariously) and the post-wilderness generation. Bearing in mind our prior discussion of the covenant motif, it is noteworthy that Deut 29:11 MT unites entry into the land and entry into the covenant; עבר, used elsewhere of crossing the Jordan, is re-used for 'crossing over' into the covenant.<sup>179</sup>

We will consider the extent to which Hebrews' own use of land imagery is commensurate with this Deuteronomic perspective. By 'land', we are concerned with

---

<sup>173</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 44.

<sup>174</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 18.

<sup>175</sup> Harl, "Cantique," 188-89 remarks that the LXX Pentateuch always reserves inheritance language for the land. Cf. Deut 19:3, where the cities of refuge are distributed (καταμερίζω) rather than inherited (נחל – MT).

<sup>176</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 44. See more generally 44-52.

<sup>177</sup> J. G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy* (JSOTSup 33; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 11.

<sup>178</sup> Rad, "Sabbath," 95.

<sup>179</sup> This nuance was particularly reworked at Qumran. Cf. Martin G. Abegg, "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians," in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C R. De Roo; SJSJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 90: "Joining the Qumran community was unmistakably pictured in sectarian thought as crossing (the Jordan) into (the land of) the covenant." The LXX, however, reads παρελθεῖν, which is not used in relation to traversing the Jordan, at least by Deuteronomy (though cf. Josh 4:23).

the theme at a macro-level, the *Landnahme* goal that Jewish tradition tied back to the Abrahamic promise and which reached its zenith in the Joshuanic conquest. Within Hebrews, the land motif operates as a teleological goal; it is a key component of the Abraham discourse (11:8-16) and a focal point of 3:7-4:11, where it is juxtaposed with the κατάπαυσις motif. We shall argue, however, that land imagery also surfaces at other points in the letter, and such references corporately reflect the way in which Hebrews echoes Deuteronomy's perspective on the land.

Despite (maybe even because of) its high regard for life in the land, Deuteronomy is somewhat realistic or sceptical about its reality, anticipating disobedience, rebellion and exile (29:22-28, 31:16-18, 32:15-25). Amidst its enthusiasm for the land as a telic goal, Deuteronomy anticipates a deeper sense to the goal's achievement, typified, but not fulfilled, by Canaan.<sup>180</sup> Burden notes how "for the Deuteronomist, the land, though a part of the promises of Abraham, is potentially more tragic than the wilderness."<sup>181</sup> The anticipated curses upon Israel in the land (28:15-68) far outnumber the blessings (28:1-14) and are levied on the land itself (29:22-24). The Shechem covenant renewal ceremony, the supposed celebration of entry into the land, is conducted upon Ebal, the mount of curse (27:4), rather than Gerizim, the mount of blessing. Moses' failure to enter the land presupposes a significance to Israel's pilgrimage beyond merely the physical possession of the territory; his death is "a metaphor for the necessary and inevitable losses and limits of human life and power before God" implying that "the full experience of the promised land is in some way beyond their (i.e. Israel's) grasp."<sup>182</sup>

As we observed in section 1.2, the fictional 'land threshold' posture adopted by the Deuteronomic narrative does not silence voices that betray the text's original west-Jordan provenance (1:5, 29:22-28, 32:13-14); portions of the book reveal their conception in Canaan itself. Even for the writer in the land, the latter remains a telic goal, and continues to symbolize the anticipated rest beyond entry and exile.

---

<sup>180</sup> J. G. McConville, "Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Literature," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; SJSJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 22-40 also advocates a more nuanced view of the land in Deuteronomy. Divine presence is not bound to a single place – it is wherever YHWH is. The land idea is more sophisticated than merely Canaan; with the book's exilic overtones, Deuteronomy's depiction of the land is ambiguous, reflecting a wandering and homeless people anticipating their imminent home. Israel "is ready for 'land' in its broadest terms" (34).

<sup>181</sup> Burden, *Kerygma*, 117.

<sup>182</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 17.



Although its (post-)exilic audience would have experienced both the blessings and curses of landed existence, Deuteronomy still transports them back pre-conquest to furnish a context for defining faithful obedience to YHWH. They stand at the threshold of the land as if they had never previously entered it; they remain on a journey, with the fulfilment of their rest still ahead.<sup>183</sup> Davies notes: "It is clear that the 'land of Israel' was never defined with geographic precision: it is an idea as well as a territory. It seems always to have carried ideal overtones without geographical and political precision."<sup>184</sup>

We have already established that Heb 6:8 alludes to the cursed land of Deut 29:22-28 as a warning against the cursed destiny of the apostate; it may also have more specific application in foretelling the physical demise/cursing of the earthly Jerusalem.<sup>185</sup> If such an allusion were legitimate, it would be one in which both Deuteronomy and Hebrews are pessimistic as to the capability of the physical Canaan existence to bring about the desired rest and peace. This failure of landed life to generate the anticipated rest is prefaced in Deuteronomy, and subsequently developed within both Ps 95 and Hebrews.

#### **4.3.2 Heb 3:7-4:11**

The exposition of Ps 95:7-11 in Heb 3:7-4:11 is the focal point for any discussion of the letter's Canaan/land imagery.<sup>186</sup> Although γῆ is absent from chapters 3-4, both the psalm itself and its exposition in Heb 3:7-19 define κατάπαυσις as the land/rest into which disobedient Israel were denied access.<sup>187</sup> The three questions of 3:16-18 recall the imagery of Num 13-14/Deut 1, and the failure of the wilderness generation at Kadesh Barnea becomes the foundational

---

<sup>183</sup> See Rad, "Ancient," 3-13, esp. 10-11: Deuteronomy "thought of itself as still on the way, still in the expectation of the final rest."

<sup>184</sup> W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (The Biblical Seminar 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 17. Only once (Deut 32:49) is the promised land specifically named as Canaan – Sonnet, *Book*, 218.

<sup>185</sup> Gleason, "Eschatology," 107.

<sup>186</sup> On the general Deuteronomical character of Heb 3:7-4:11, see David M. Allen, "More Than Just Numbers: Deuteronomical Influence in Hebrews 3:7-4:11," *TynBul* forthcoming.

<sup>187</sup> Andrew T. Lincoln, "Sabbath, Rest, and Eschatology in the New Testament," in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 208: "The primary meaning from the context must be a local one with reference to the land of Canaan."

historical exemplar from which the NC community must learn (3:12-14, 3:19-4:2). At the very least, the land motif functions as a hortatory tool, utilised as a sobering lesson of the implications of faithlessness, potentially anticipating the impossibility of repentance discourses of 6:4-8 and 12:15-17.<sup>188</sup>

Hebrews 4:3-11 reworks this land-rest relationship, and κατάπαυσις undergoes a metamorphosis that is both ontological and chronological. With an analogical play upon Gen 2:2 (4:3-4), κατάπαυσις is redefined in terms of the Creator's own rest (4:4), a σαββατισμὸς that is participation in the divine rest of YHWH himself (4:9-10). As the promise of entering the rest still remains (4:1, 4:6, 4:9), and since the 'today' of Ps 95:7 postdates the Canaan entry (4:7), Hebrews surmises that Joshua could not have given Israel rest (4:8).<sup>189</sup> Κατάπαυσις is no longer Canaan,<sup>190</sup> but rather the heavenly rest that the faithful audience now enter. The scholarly consensus therefore concludes that, by 4:3, the land is relativized in Hebrews' thinking and fulfils no further purpose in the argument, often with the implicit association that Canaan serves no typological significance within the letter.<sup>191</sup> This apparent downplaying of the land is also said to inform Hebrews'

---

<sup>188</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 254 contends that the comparison of 3:7-4:13 is not one of earthly/heavenly typology, but rather of generations, between the faithlessness of the wilderness era and the expected faithfulness of the new era. The generational comparison is certainly a valid one, but *pace* Ellingworth, we venture that it only works because the destiny of each generation is cast within a 'land' paradigm.

<sup>189</sup> Taking the consensus reading of Ἰησοῦς (4:8) as Joshua rather than Jesus, because of the prior OT/wilderness context. KJV renders "Jesus" and Worley, *Faithfulness*, 209 advocates this as a possible reading. Only YHWH (κύριος) actually gives rest, and Jesus – as κύριος – cannot give rest to Israel until he has fulfilled his high-priestly sacrifice, and then "come again for salvation" (9:28).

<sup>190</sup> Kistemaker, *Psalms*, 110.

<sup>191</sup> Judith Hoch Wray, *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth: Early Christian Homiletics of Rest* (SBLDS 166; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 72: "the land is no longer the issue in the psalm or in Heb." Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 254: the author "does not even see Canaan as a positive antitype of God's own κατάπαυσις: to him it is merely something to be contrasted with that true rest." Barnabas Lindars, *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 53-54 rejects any typological association between Canaan and the heavenly κατάπαυσις on the basis that Hebrews grounds his argument in Ps 95 itself, rather than in historical events which are fulfilled in Christ. His view, however, is overly reductive. Whilst Hebrews' may glean the content of the κατάπαυσις from the Psalm, this does not negate the typological association between the apostasy at Kadesh Barnea and any prospective apostasy on the part of the NC community (3:7-4:2, 4:11). On the reconstruction of land theology generally in 'Rewritten Bible' texts, see Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994), 25-127.

supposed middle platonic earthly/heavenly distinction (cf. 12:25-28), so negating any physical reference to the land because it is 'earthly' (cf. 11:10, 13-16).<sup>192</sup>

Not all scholars, however, reject the land's ongoing geographical significance. Its most notable advocate is George Buchanan, for whom Canaan remains the primary referent for κατάπαυσις in both Ps 95:7-11/Heb 3:7-19 and Heb 4:1-11.<sup>193</sup> He criticizes the consensus for articulating 'spiritual' readings of the text and for being inconsistent in their understanding of the land concept. He contends that Joshua's (non)-rest (4:8) is a pointer to the messianic rule that would – under Christ – establish Jerusalem to her true glory; on his reading, κατάπαυσις is rest from Israel's Roman enemies in the land and the triumphant restoration of Israel to her ultimate glory.<sup>194</sup>

Buchanan's thesis goes beyond the evidence and runs counter to the heavenly emphasis of 11:16 or 12:22; it also presupposes a Palestinian context to the letter, which, whilst possible, is only one option for a text that lacks significant geographical orientation.<sup>195</sup> If anything, physical Jerusalem is sidelined rather than affirmed in the letter's discourse (cf. 13:11-4).<sup>196</sup> One wonders, however, if there is not some middle ground between the pro-land position of Buchanan and the widely endorsed 'spiritual' explanation of which he is critical.<sup>197</sup> Scholarly enthusiasm for, and emphasis upon, the heavenly dimension to κατάπαυσις must not eclipse the land's ongoing function in the letter. Von Rad rightly observes that 'my rest' (Ps 95:11) already reorientates κατάπαυσις heavenwards, away from Canaan, and Heb 4:1-11 replicates that movement.<sup>198</sup> But the fact remains that 3:7-19 still uses the

---

<sup>192</sup> Knut Backhaus, "Das Land der Verheissung: die Heimat der Glaubenden im Hebräerbrief," *NTS* 47 (2001): 172-83 argues that Hebrews desanctifies the 'earthly' images of land and rest, such that they are effectively removed from the letter's purview.

<sup>193</sup> Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 64-65. A pro-Palestine position is perhaps also implicit in Gleason, "Angels," 101n47. He cites Buchanan approvingly for advocating a messianic figure "who would rule as king from his throne at Jerusalem."

<sup>194</sup> Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 73-74.

<sup>195</sup> The reference to τῆς Ἰταλίας (13:24) is hardly decisive in dictating the provenance of the letter; it may refer to a Roman origin or destination, or lack any geographical significance whatsoever.

<sup>196</sup> See P. W. L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 218-20.

<sup>197</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, affirms Buchanan for taking the theme seriously, though still maintains that Hebrews looks beyond the land and re-locates to a "beatific state in heaven." (82).

<sup>198</sup> Rad, "Sabbath," 99-102.

land exemplar to sustain its argument, and if this reference is removed, the warning of 3:16-4:2 ultimately lacks any substance. If the rest of God is *not merely* the rest of Canaan under Joshua,<sup>199</sup> then it follows that rest is "*at least* the Canaan rest,"<sup>200</sup> and this is so even for 4:1-11. The negation of Joshua's rest (4:8) demonstrates the very need for clarification on the land/rest relationship and requires that some form of tentative association between Canaan and κατάπαυσις remains. Their frequent Septuagintal correlation also makes it highly unlikely that Hebrews' audience would completely disassociate Canaan even from the discourse of 4:3-13.<sup>201</sup> The land retains some typological significance for Hebrews.

Development in the meaning of κατάπαυσις (4:1-11), moreover, need not occasion a change in the motif's function; even if physical Canaan is removed from Hebrews' matrix, the *Landnahme* concept continues to exert a significant rhetorical function within the letter. Hebrews endorses Deuteronomy's conclusion on Canaan's incapacity to furnish the anticipated rest, but, in both texts, one must distinguish between the land as a physical entity and its conceptual function as an ongoing symbol of Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*.<sup>202</sup> Land remains a powerful metaphor for salvation under the NC, particularly in regard to the destiny of the faithful. Von Rad observes how "promises which have been fulfilled in history are not thereby exhausted of their content, but remain as promises on a different level, although they are to some extent metamorphosed in the process. The promise of the land was proclaimed ever anew, even after its fulfilment, as a future benefit of God's

---

<sup>199</sup> Hewitt, *Epistle*, 87.

<sup>200</sup> Khiok-Khng Yeo, "The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of 'Rest' (Katapausis and Sabbatismos) in Hebrews 3:7-4:13," *AJT* 5 (1991): 11, my emphasis. Walter Kaiser, "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest," *BSac* 130 (1973): 135-50 argues that the Canaan rest was a down payment on the full rest to come. Cf. Lincoln, "Sabbath," 209: "It seems very likely that being acquainted with such a tradition the writer to the Hebrews views 'rest' as an eschatological resting place with associations with the heavenly promised land, the heavenly Jerusalem and the heavenly sanctuary." Also Hofius, *Katapausis*, 22-58.

<sup>201</sup> Cf. F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 109: "The parallel between the Old Testament 'Jesus', who led his followers into the earthly Canaan, and Jesus the Son of God, who leads the heirs of the new covenant into their heavenly inheritance .... could hardly have been absent from our author's mind."

<sup>202</sup> In Saussurian terms, the 'signified' may change (earthly -> heavenly), but the 'signifier' (the land motif) remains constant.

redemptive activity."<sup>203</sup> Bruce also maintains the land's telic symbolism, venturing: "the world to come is a promised land into which the redeemed have to march."<sup>204</sup>

It is further necessary to differentiate between land as possession (the experience of living in the land, a concept to which the author is fairly ambivalent),<sup>205</sup> and its function as a goal to which both Abraham and wilderness Israel journeyed and to which the NC community is now inexorably headed. Hebrews shares the quasi-Deuteronomic sense of land as a soteriological goal;<sup>206</sup> it is a significant tool in the writer's development of the salvation inheritance of the faithful. Just as the land of Deuteronomy should not be robbed of its soteriological context, so likewise Hebrews; although κατάπαυσις is not explicitly equated with σωτηρία, the elevated, heavenly status ascribed to the rest casts it in salvific terms.<sup>207</sup> In her excellent study on the letter's use of sacred space imagery, Isaacs notes that "Hebrews builds upon the premise that locality and condition, land and salvation are inextricable."<sup>208</sup> The soteriological land/rest to which Israel was headed is the same land/rest σωτηρία (albeit expanded and "re-located"<sup>209</sup> heavenward) to which Hebrews' faithful pilgrims are destined. In both texts, each addressed audience stand at the threshold of entry to their new 'land' (12:22-24), exhorted to press faithfully onwards, towards their goal.

#### **4.3.3 Other appeals to land imagery**

Although 3:7-4:11 is the largest unit dealing with land imagery in Hebrews, it is not the first. We have already discussed how Heb 1:6 frames Christ's ascension

---

<sup>203</sup> Gerhard von Rad, "Promised Land and Yahweh's Land," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966), 93.

<sup>204</sup> A. Bruce, *Epistle*, 93.

<sup>205</sup> Cf. the minimal use of occupation material in ch. 11.

<sup>206</sup> C. Marvin Pate, *The Story of Israel: A Biblical Theology* (Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 249-52 advocates that entry into the rest is the overall point of the letter; one might easily make the same claim for the land in Deuteronomy.

<sup>207</sup> H. A. Lombard, "Katapausis in the Letter to the Hebrews," *Neot* (1971): 60-71 argues that κατάπαυσις be viewed primarily soteriologically, rather than within the purely the eschatological framework advocated by Hofius. Attridge, *Epistle*, 128 takes a similar view: "(T)he imagery of rest is best understood as a complex symbol for the whole soteriological process that Hebrews never fully articulates, but which involves both personal and corporate dimensions."

<sup>208</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, 82.

<sup>209</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, 82, 86.

into the heavenly world against the backdrop of Israel's entry into the promised land.<sup>210</sup> From the letter's outset therefore, the function of the land as salvation 'goal' is drawn.

On a broader level, the land imagery seems intertwined with an overarching 'exodus' theme operative throughout the letter.<sup>211</sup> As well as the opening declaration of 1:6, the paradigmatic use of the wilderness generation (3:7-19) and the pilgrimage imagery of ch. 11, the overtones of the leaders' ἑκβασίς (13:7 – cf. 1 Cor 10:13), the exhortation to go outside the camp (13:13 – ἐξέρχομαι), and, most notably, the climax at Zion (12:22-24) – the new Sinai (12:18-21) – all contribute to an exodus/journey ideology.<sup>212</sup> Koester suggests that 13:20 echoes the shepherding language of Isa 63:11 LXX and the image of YHWH leading Moses up from Egypt; if so, then Jesus' ascent into heaven is cast in exodus deliverance terminology and offers a parallel, at the letter's close, to the exodus imagery established by 1:6.<sup>213</sup> Just as God led the Son *into* the heavenly arena (εἰσάγω – 1:6), he also led him *up* (ἀνάγω – 13:20) into heaven. Christ is presented as the one who releases those held in slavery (2:15), the ἀρχηγός that leads his people out of servitude to the heavenly arena (2:10);<sup>214</sup> signs and wonders testify to the announcement of salvation (2:3-4), evocative of the same events that accompanied the exodus (Deut 4:34, 6:22, 26:8, 34:11, Neh 9:11, Ps 134:9).<sup>215</sup> The parenthetical reference to the help of the seed of Abraham (2:16) probably refers to the NC community as true heirs of the Abrahamic promise (6:13-20; cf. 2:12-13),<sup>216</sup> but also secondarily anticipates the fulfilment of the land promise made to Abraham. Where he never received his land inheritance (11:9-10), and the exodus generation also failed to enter (3:7-19), the audience of Hebrews become the true recipients of the land. The latter becomes the paradigmatic goal to which the NC pilgrims are headed, guided by a new Ἰησοῦς (4:8), who is greater than the Moses who led them out of Egypt (3:1-6).

---

<sup>210</sup> See 3.1.1

<sup>211</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 74: "there is no denying the pervasiveness of the exodus theme." See also Enns, "Creation," 255-80; Nixon, *Exodus*, 25-27.

<sup>212</sup> Lehne, *New*, 106.

<sup>213</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 573; also Walker, *Jesus*, 213; Michel, *Brief*, 537.

<sup>214</sup> See further 5.2.2.

<sup>215</sup> Regenstorff, *TDNT* 7:216: within the OT, "the reference is almost always to the leading of the people out of Egypt by Moses."

<sup>216</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 94.

Indeed, *eisodus*, rather than *exodus*, is actually the core motif for Hebrews. Where the NC community are headed (or where they have drawn near to – cf. 10:19-22, 12:18, 12:21) is more significant than where they have left. The benefits of the goal they have yet to receive are the inducement for faithfulness in their pilgrim existence (6:11-12, 10:35-36, 12:1). Any *exodus* in Hebrews would be somewhat incongruous or anachronistic without a land into which the faithful are to pilgrim, and if the imagery of 1:6, 3:16-19 and 11:8-10 is seen as consistent, the Canaan motif fulfils that criterion.

#### **4.3.4 Heb 11**

Alongside 3:7-4:11, Hebrews' other significant land discourse is 11:8-12, where  $\gamma\eta$  is expounded in the context of the Abraham narrative. Both 4:1-11 and 11:8-10 (and subsequently 11:13-16) are traditionally viewed as the highpoint of the spiritual depiction of the land, stripping it of any geographical or earthly significance. Abraham is portrayed as a stranger in the land of promise (11:9; cf. 11:13), a tented sojourner rather than its domiciled citizen. He does not 'receive' the land (11:13); instead, he sees beyond the opaqueness of the Canaanite existence and awaits the city designed by God (11:10). Abraham's alien existence in the land promised to him and his anticipation of a better, heavenly homeland apparently relegates the land of promise to a vastly inferior status, subsumed by the expectation of the city of divine foundations. For Lane, the labelling of Abraham's inheritance as a τόπος (11:8) – as opposed to  $\gamma\eta$  – drives an even greater wedge between the physical Canaan and the true city of promise.<sup>217</sup>

As with the redefinition of κατάπαυσις in 4:1-11, however, the heavenly dimension to Abraham's ultimate goal does not negate the land's continued significance within the chapter. Canaan may be merely a 'place' in 11:8, but it remains the 'land of promise' in 11:9,<sup>218</sup> and continues to fulfil a hortatory purpose within the pericope. Spicq ascribes it an ongoing allegorical function in the chapter, describing it as a "figure de la vie éternelle."<sup>219</sup> The forefathers' perception of the

---

<sup>217</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 349.

<sup>218</sup> Γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας' lacks prior LXX reference, but we understand it as synonymous with the promised land. Cf. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 583: "References to the promised land are characteristic of Deuteronomy."

<sup>219</sup> Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.350.

land from afar (11:13) draws upon the parallel image of Moses viewing Canaan only from Mount Nebo (Deut 34:4; cf. also 3:27, 32:29, 52), an image perhaps also evoked subsequently in 11:26 where Moses looks ahead (ἀπέβλεπεν) to his reward (11:26).<sup>220</sup> Πόρρωθεν has a spatial rather than temporal sense,<sup>221</sup> and it allows for an insightful allusion between two heroic figures that were unable to enjoy citizenship in Canaan. 'Land' functions as goal even in terms of its non-achievement.

It is crucial how one understands γῆ (11:13), almost universally rendered as 'earth' in modern translations.<sup>222</sup> Hebrews certainly uses γῆ in this way elsewhere, especially in comparison with heavenly imagery (1:10, 8:4, 12:25-26), and the subsequent ἐπουρανίου (11:16) makes the case for 'earth' in 11:13 entirely plausible.<sup>223</sup> Likewise, the similar form ἐπὶ γῆς (12:25) can only mean 'on earth,' rather than 'in the land' (cf. 11:9 – εἰς γῆν). Prepositions, however, are notoriously difficult foundations for exegetical decisions and ἐπουρανίου (11:16) appears to modify πατρίδα (11:14) rather than γῆ (11:13).<sup>224</sup> Moreover, since γῆ in 11:9 must be 'land', it seems equally possible – and perhaps more contextually consistent – to continue to render it so in 11:13.<sup>225</sup> Several reasons support this translation. First, as already noted, the reference in the same verse (11:13) to 'viewing from afar' alludes to the specific scenario of Moses' denial of access to Canaan. Second, 11:9 and 11:13 are strongly parallel; Abraham's sojourning in the land (11:9) correlates with his existence as a stranger and foreigner there (11:13) and in both verses γῆ is closely related to the notion of ἐπαγγελία. Third, conceiving of the promise in relation to 'earth' seems an odd concept at this stage of the argument; it makes more sense for γῆ to continue to refer to Canaan – the land of promise – upon which Abraham himself claimed he was a stranger and alien. The biblical record never attests Abraham himself as actually being in possession of the land, never as actually

---

<sup>220</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 615.

<sup>221</sup> Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 263. Attridge, *Epistle*, 329n13 suggests this might echo Gen 22:4, where Abraham sees Mount Moriah 'from afar'. This suggestion would be persuasive, except that Gen 22:4 renders μακρόθεν rather than πόρρωθεν.

<sup>222</sup> *Inter alia* NIV, ESV, NASB, NRSV, KJV.

<sup>223</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 594-95; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 196; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 393; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 361; Koester, *Hebrews*, 489 all read 'on the earth'.

<sup>224</sup> Contra Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.350.

<sup>225</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 346.



'inheriting' it;<sup>226</sup> only his 'seed' subsequently achieve such possession. Therefore, although the LXX never describes the land as ἀλλότριος, Heb 11:9 is quite consistent with the OT *Vorlage*; 'living as strangers and aliens in the land' (11:13) is no word play, but an attentive reading of the biblical narrative.

Reading γῆ (11:13) as 'land' denies neither the heavenly re-orientation of the land motif in 11:10/11:16 nor the earthly/heavenly dichotomy that elevates the heavenly city above and beyond its earthly counterpart (cf. 13:14). It rather stresses the continuing function of the land promise as a telic motif in the letter and metaphor for the pilgrim life of the faithful believer. Where Abraham demonstrated πίστις in journeying toward the promised land without being privy to its full realization and only seeing it from afar, the pilgrim believers likewise journey in their earthly existence knowing that they are not yet 'in the Land'. Although Abraham and Sarah are blessed with abundant descendants (11:11-12; cf. 6:15), the land aspect of the promise remains unfulfilled.<sup>227</sup> With this sense of delayed expectation (11:9-10, 13-16), the land motif functions on a *negative* level; the forefathers' non-attainment of Canaan parallels the believer's present non-attainment of the heavenly promises.<sup>228</sup>

The purposeful function of the land is further evident from the subsequent development of ch.11. The encomium has some form of terminus at the capture of Jericho;<sup>229</sup> from this point onwards, the faithful are mentioned only by name, given little explication and, 11:33 aside, not accorded the laudatory πίστει. Opinions differ, however, as to the significance of the pause. Peter Walker suggests, for example, that the subsequent silence on life in Canaan "implies a critique of any over-emphasis on the land," and consequently "faithful living does not depend upon residence there."<sup>230</sup> One suggests, however, that the converse may actually be the case; the appeal to the fall of Jericho in 11:30 might counter any subsequent '*under-*

---

<sup>226</sup> Kaiser, "Promise," 144 – cf. Acts 7:4-5.

<sup>227</sup> Οἱ πάντες (11:13) pertains not to all the subjects of 11:1-12 (so Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 160), but just to those of 11:8-12 (so Attridge, *Epistle*, 329; Gordon, *Hebrews*, 134-35; Michel, *Brief*, 397). Enoch and Noah are recipients of some reward or commendation and there is no emphasis upon their awaiting something. The subsequent use of οἱ πάντες (11:39), however, includes all the listed μάρτυρες.

<sup>228</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 593.

<sup>229</sup> The climax includes the paradigmatic faithfulness of Rahab (11:31), but as her action chronologically precedes the fall, her inclusion probably demonstrates how "the call to be faithful extends beyond the boundaries of the people of the old covenant" – Attridge, *Epistle*, 344.

<sup>230</sup> Walker, *Jesus*, 211.

*emphasis*' upon the land, with the rhetorical καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω actually attesting the zenith of the prior argument. One must again differentiate between life 'in the land' and the land as 'soteriological goal'; the subsequent absence of explication on hero figures in the land is precisely because, in some fashion, the initial soteriological goal of Israel's history was achieved.<sup>231</sup> Where Israel's first generation fell because of faithlessness (3:15-19; 4:2), and are unsurprisingly omitted from the *Beispielreihen*,<sup>232</sup> so Israel's next (faithful) generation succeeded in reaching their intended salvation goal, the same one appealed to in 3:15-19. Whilst Hebrews does not consider their journey fully complete (cf. 11:39-40), it does invest the Canaan entry with some element of significance, a watershed on their pilgrimage.<sup>233</sup> Westcott's suggestion, that Jericho's fall typologically asserts the triumph of the church, overplays the imagery,<sup>234</sup> but his comment nonetheless recognises the rhetorical climax that the conquest occasions; Hebrews makes direct historical appeal to Israel's successful achievement of the goal through faithful obedience to YHWH's call. Gordon's comment is apt in this regard: "it may be that the mere fact of Israel's nation status was less congenial for a portrayal of the 'life of faith' in terms of *pilgrimage and patient hope*" (my emphasis).<sup>235</sup> Precisely because Israel's pilgrimage to their goal is partially complete, the grounds for appeal to historical precedent are no longer pertinent. YHWH/Christ can be similarly trusted to bring them to the culmination of the NC journey (cf. 6:17-18, 10:23).

The text of 11:30 itself seems to bear this out. The verse notably lacks a human subject or explicit embodiment of faithfulness and no concrete basis is given for why the walls of Jericho fell 'by faith'. Joshua is possibly the agent of πίστις,<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>231</sup> Gordon, *Hebrews*, 143. Ambivalence to life in the land may also reflect the specifically Christian reading of the Jewish story (so Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 225).

<sup>232</sup> As the paradigm of ἀπιστία in 3:7-19, their inclusion in a chapter on πίστις would be self-contradictory. The reference to τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν (11:31) probably alludes back to the wilderness generation; the object of the disbelief might be the idea that Israel would inherit the land (so Dods et al., *Greek*, 362).

<sup>233</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 187-88 argues the reverse: the absence of post-conquest narrative implies that the land promise has *not* been fulfilled.

<sup>234</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 375.

<sup>235</sup> Gordon, *Hebrews*, 144.

<sup>236</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 317.

though one wonders why, if so, this is not made more explicit by the text.<sup>237</sup> Since the people of God are contextually in view (11:28-29), their seven days of faithfully circling the city walls is probably a significant aspect of the verse's appeal.<sup>238</sup> The text, however, may also point elsewhere; τὰ τεῖχῃ ἐπιχῶ is the subject of both the main verb and participle, and the change of subject to an inanimate object (uniquely so in 11:4-31) suggests that the agent of faithfulness is possibly YHWH himself.<sup>239</sup> In a discourse full of human heroes, YHWH's faithfulness has been demonstrated by Israel's belief in his inherent πίστις (cf. 10:23, 11:11), and manifested by their faithful encircling of Jericho. The absence of personal reference in 11:30 underscores YHWH's own distinctive contribution in bringing them into their promised inheritance.

Hebrews 11:8-30, therefore, reveals something of a tension in Hebrews' use of the land motif. The chapter's primary thrust is the delay in receiving what was promised; it portrays a pilgrim people, faithfully journeying to a land that is not yet their possession (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses), and which they would not possess in their lifetime.<sup>240</sup> Yet the chapter also recognizes the accessibility of the promised goal – with the fall of Jericho and entry into the land, the destination is reached, albeit in a subsequent generation. The historical precedent of the entry is evidence that the pilgrimage of the faithful is not in vain and, although Heb 11:39-40 locates perfection and beyond the heroic, earthly life, the goal of Canaan entry prefigures the ultimate perfection that awaits the faithful community.

---

<sup>237</sup> So Moffatt, *Commentary*, 183. Joshua's omission is probably part of Hebrews' strategy of exploiting the association between the old covenant ἡσούς and that of the new – see 5.2.

<sup>238</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 378; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 184; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 213.

<sup>239</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 505. Cf. 2 Macc 12:15-16, where YHWH is one who overthrows Jericho.

<sup>240</sup> Cf. Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 172: "the fact that Moses never entered the promised land made him a good candidate for the heroes list."

## **Chapter 5: Homiletical Affinities between Hebrews and Deuteronomy**

### **5.1 Introduction**

So far in our study, we have examined Hebrews' direct citations of Deuteronomy (chapter 3), and subsequently, the way in which Deuteronomic themes and categories are revisited and reworked within the epistolary text (chapter 4). We have found significant evidence of Deuteronomic material replayed within Hebrews' hortatory passages, with Deut 29 and 32 particularly well represented in terms of source material. We will now consider whether there are broader rhetorical perspectives or hermeneutical agendas common to both texts; does Hebrews grapple with Deuteronomy beyond using it as a convenient mine of appropriate texts and imagery? We will discuss three ways in which the Deuteronomic agenda is taken and replayed within Hebrews' new covenant milieu.

Such a study has never before been seriously attempted,<sup>1</sup> surprisingly so, since the two texts are not that dissimilar. Both place significant emphasis on hearing,<sup>2</sup> and are avowedly sermoniac, purporting to be oral communication delivered by a community leader,<sup>3</sup> both, however, ultimately dispense with their homiletic context and arrive in written form. Both texts are anonymous,<sup>4</sup> manifesting an intricate intertwining of doctrinal and hortatory material<sup>5</sup> that is simultaneously artistic at the micro-level and satisfyingly 'whole' or complete at the macro.<sup>6</sup> They

---

<sup>1</sup> Close attempts include Dunnill, *Covenant*, 123-48 and Isaacs, *Sacred*, 78-88.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deut 4:1, 6:3-4. Stephen A. Geller, *Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible* (London: Routledge, 1996), 39: "Deuteronomy 4 has established a context in which 'seeing' and 'hearing' are contrasted rather than combined in the common hendiadys...; hearing is promoted, seeing is demoted in significance as regards revelation." Karrer, "Epistle," 341 similarly notes Hebrews' distrust of seeing: "the major way is to hear."

<sup>3</sup> Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 23 describes Deuteronomy's form as "homiletic instruction for the laity," though notes the various sub-genres operating within the text. The sermoniac status of Hebrews is expounded in Lane, *Hebrews*, lxx-lxxv; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Hebrews: A Guide* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 9-14.

<sup>4</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 264 remarks: Hebrews "is anonymous for the same reason that Deuteronomy is anonymous ... because it derives its authority not from its writer, even its writer as servant or apostle of God, but from conforming itself to the address of God himself."

<sup>5</sup> On the doctrinal/paraenesis split in Hebrews, see especially Guthrie, *Structure*, 112-47. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, xix notes that Deuteronomy combines historical, legislative and paraenetic material, of which the latter is the most important.

<sup>6</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 134; Attridge, *Epistle*, 19-20. Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 12-13: "Deuteronomy presents itself to us almost as a mosaic of innumerable, extremely varied pieces of traditional material. But at

also possess an opening prologue (Deut 1:1-5; Heb 1:1-4) that establishes the context for the rest of the document. Both exhibit a primary concern to encourage their audience to press on towards their ultimate goal by remaining obedient members of the community, and not fall by the wayside through disobedience. Both warn of the life-threatening dangers of apostasy, yet simultaneously elucidate covenantal dispensations that anticipate rejection and judgment.<sup>7</sup>

Most studies of Hebrews' rhetoric focus upon the letter's affinities with contemporary rhetorical praxis and convention. Notable research topics include Hebrews' similarity to synagogue homiletics,<sup>8</sup> its embodiment of formal rhetorical structures,<sup>9</sup> its abundant usage of sophisticated rhetorical devices<sup>10</sup> and its familiarity with Greco-Roman rhetorical textbook conventions.<sup>11</sup> Scholars differ on whether the rhetoric is deliberative<sup>12</sup> or epideictic,<sup>13</sup> but the recent consensus has questioned whether either category fully accounts for the letter's overall composition;<sup>14</sup> a

---

the same time this is not to deny that the book must nevertheless in the last resort be understood as a unity."

<sup>7</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 133.

<sup>8</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, lxix-lxxv; James Swetnam, "On the Literary Genre of the "Epistle" to the Hebrews," *NovT* 11 (1969): 261-69; Lawrence Wills, "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity," *HTR* 77 (1984): 280-83; Steve Stanley, "The Structure of Hebrews from Three Perspectives," *TynBul* 45 (1994): 248-50; Lyle O. Bristol, "Primitive Christian Preaching and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 68 (1949): 89-97; Gabriella Gelardini, "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha Be-Av: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights* (ed. Gabriella Gelardini; Biblical Interpretation Series 75; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 107-27.

<sup>9</sup> Koester, "Rhetoric," 103-23.

<sup>10</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 20-21 lists the following devices: alliteration, anaphora, antithesis, assonance, asyndeton, brachylogy, chiasm, ellipse, hendiadys, hyperbaton, isocolon, litotes and paronomasia.

<sup>11</sup> See deSilva, *Perseverance*, 35-58.

<sup>12</sup> Lindars, "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews," 382-406; Hermut Löhr, "Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights* (ed. Gabriella Gelardini; Biblical Interpretation Series 75; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 210.

<sup>13</sup> Harold W. Attridge, "Paraenesis in a Homily (λόγος παρακλήσεως): The Possible Location of, and Socialization in, the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'," *Semeia* 80 (1990): 214; Olbricht, "Amplification," 375-87; David Edward Aune, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (LEC 8; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 212-13 states that Hebrews is epideictic, but warns: "it is not structured in accordance with the typical patterns of epideictic or (the closely related) deliberative rhetoric."

<sup>14</sup> Craig R. Koester, "The Epistle to the Hebrews in Recent Study," *Currents in Research* 2 (1994); Lane, *Hebrews*, lxxix: "Hebrews cannot be forced into the mould of a classical speech.... (it) has a serious pastoral purpose and consequently is not bound by classical conventions." Also Attridge, "Paraenesis," 217: "paraclesis is in fact a mutant on the evolutionary trail of ancient rhetoric."

combination of both approaches is probably more appropriate.<sup>15</sup> Rhetorical analysis has also generated further interest in the cultural milieu in which the letter's persuasiveness might function, the outstanding example being deSilva's discussion of the text's honour/shame discourse.<sup>16</sup>

Our focus in this chapter differs slightly from such previous research. We are concerned with the rhetorical connections Hebrews makes with the LXX Scriptures, how its rhetoric might appeal to the Deuteronomic narrative context and thereby shape both the audience's conception of their situation and their expected response. In terms of Heb 11, for example, we are more interested in Hebrews' decision to rhetorically align the audience with the heroes of Jewish history, than with the undoubtedly impressive rhetorical techniques by which the alignment is enhanced.<sup>17</sup>

For our purposes, 'rhetoric' should be understood as a mid-point between the intertextual approach exemplified (in biblical studies at least) by Richard Hays<sup>18</sup> and the oral tradition to which Hebrews' more homiletic character is disposed. An appropriate designation for it is 'interaurality.' It recognizes that Hebrews takes 'speaking' seriously and its sermonic character facilitates the creation of images through the power of rhetoric. But it is evident that such images are drawn from Israel's sacred texts, and thus possess a particular narrative characterisation. In contrast to our analysis in chapter 3, the approach requires minimal textual literacy from the audience; it necessitates only a broad familiarity with Israel's story from which the argument cannot be divorced.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Watson, "Rhetorical," 186-187: "The genre of the letter is typically determined to be deliberative, but the more that the role of synkrisis is recognized, the more the letter is classified as epideictic rhetoric with deliberative intent." Likewise Lincoln, *Hebrews*, 16: "the epideictic material is in fact in service of the deliberative." See also deSilva, *Perseverance*, 48-58; Aune, *New*, 213; Alan D. Bulley, "Death and Rhetoric in the Hebrews 'Hymn to Faith'," *SR* 25 (1996): 418-20.

<sup>16</sup> DeSilva, *Despising*.

<sup>17</sup> See Cosby, *Rhetorical*, 25-91.

<sup>18</sup> Principally demonstrated in Hays, *Echoes*.

<sup>19</sup> We make no claim as to the Jewish or Gentile composition of the implied audience. Strong familiarity with particular texts such as Deut 32 would certainly enhance appreciation of Hebrews' argument, but the appeal to fundamental events such as the exodus, conquest and Moses' succession to Joshua would presumably be familiar to those Gentiles with a basic exposure to contemporary Judaism.

## **5.2 The Rhetoric of Hebrews & Deuteronomy**

Some rhetorical similarity between Deuteronomy and Hebrews has previously been suggested by John Dunnill, whose attention to the texts' textual and thematic parallels we have already had cause to mention.<sup>20</sup> Dunnill notes their common use of two intertwined themes: "sacred place" and "sacred time." "Sacred place" in Deuteronomy lays particular emphasis upon standing before YHWH (4:10, 6:25, 12:12, 12:18, 31:11) in the knowledge that all decisions are made before him; even entry into the land happens in YHWH's presence.<sup>21</sup> Deuteronomy exhibits a plurality of place of divine encounter (Horeb-Moab-Shechem), but they share an essential unity premised upon Israel standing before YHWH.<sup>22</sup> Hebrews likewise fuses together several loci (the threshold of the land, the entry to the Tent of Meeting, Mount Zion) all of which are synonymously Israel's absolute encounter with YHWH.

Hebrews depicts "sacred time" similarly as temporal unification (cf. 13:8), treating individual moments as ultimately simultaneous through its use of time terminology (Today, the Sabbath Eve and the Day of Atonement).<sup>23</sup> Once more, Dunnill proposes that such "sacred time" mirrors Deuteronomy's own temporal perspective:

Wherever Deuteronomy's hearers are, ... the occasion is always 'today', the moment of choice: they are simultaneously in the past and the present, dwelling in the syncretistic cities of seventh- or eighth-century Palestine, encamped at the foot of Mount Sinai, and standing in the plains of Moab waiting to enter the Land.<sup>24</sup>

Whilst he is less concerned with the actual source of Hebrews' divine encounter imagery,<sup>25</sup> he stresses the shared imagery of the two texts. Building upon Dunnill's proposals, the application of such characteristics within Hebrews is the focus of our analysis in this chapter.

---

<sup>20</sup> See 4.1.2.

<sup>21</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 141-48.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. McConville and Millar, *Time*, 15-88.

<sup>23</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 135-41.

<sup>24</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 134-35. McConville, *Law*, 21-38 similarly proposes that Deut 12 concerns not an exclusive, sole sanctuary, but pertains to anywhere that YHWH is worshipped.

<sup>25</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 135 ascribes '2 or 3' a Deuteronomic provenance.

There are also similarities in the rhetorical strategy and tone used by both preachers. Patrick Miller describes Deuteronomy as "rhetoric of persuasion", in which obedience is not so much commanded as "encouraged and rationalised."

Deuteronomy says that the God, who speaks in this law and through it commands the people, also engages them in a conversation that provides reasons and benefits for their obedience. They are not simply told to obey. They are not coerced. They are persuaded, by negative and positive means, by explanation and appeal to compassion, by rational argument and common sense.<sup>26</sup>

This characterisation of Deuteronomic rhetoric is broadly analogous to Hebrews' own approach. Mitchell discusses, at length, the letter's persuasive elements, emphasizing how the use of *πρέπω* (2:10) contributes to the argument's rhetorical propriety.<sup>27</sup> As with Deuteronomy, Hebrews expects disagreement from its recipients, and, on such grounds, Überlacker labels its rhetoric as 'paraclesis' rather than paraenesis (which, he argues, does not anticipate such dissension).<sup>28</sup> It characteristically alternates between affirmation and criticism; the harsh warnings of 6:4-8 are followed by the gentle praise of 6:9-11, similarly the rebuke of 10:26-31 by recollection of prior meritorious deeds (10:32-34). The author also switches between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person address in order to assuage the harshness of his message and to personally identify with his listeners. It is testimony to the texts' shared paraenetic/paracletic character that von Rad describes Deuteronomy as "*paraclesis*, a form which is developed extensively in the New Testament epistles."<sup>29</sup> Of the NT letters, only Hebrews possesses this generic self-designation.

---

<sup>26</sup> Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Deuteronomy and Psalms: Evoking a Biblical Conversation," *JBL* 118 (1999): 9-10. Cf. also McCarthy, *Treaty*, 145 on Deuteronomy: "the element of persuasion and admonition is emphasized and the effort is more to convince than to bind by contract ..., efforts to motivate, to encourage in the folk an internal consent, a resolution to be faithful."

<sup>27</sup> Alan C. Mitchell, "The Use of Prepein and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 681-701.

<sup>28</sup> Walter Überlacker, "Paraenesis or Paraclesis - Hebrews as a Test Case," in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen and James M. Starr; BZNW 125; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 319-52.

<sup>29</sup> Rad, "Ancient," 6, my emphasis.



### **5.2.1 Hebrews as valedictory address**

A further rhetorical characteristic of Deuteronomy is its broad status as Moses' pre-mortem last will and testament.<sup>30</sup> Mann contends that "the *greatest* significance of Deut as a book derives from its configuration as the narrative of Moses' farewell address, the address that constitutes his last will and testament to the new generation of Israel, the people who wait 'beyond the Jordan' for the fulfilment of the promise."<sup>31</sup> Although the text as a whole is imbued with testamentary data (Deut 1:9-18; 1:37; 3:21-29; 6:10-25), Deut 31-34 particularly exhibits paradigmatic farewell material, and is the text that significantly shapes the pseudepigraphical Testament of Moses.<sup>32</sup> Deuteronomy 31 heightens the farewell moment; Moses signals his imminent departure (31:2), prophesies future events (31:3-5), exhorts them not to fear what ensues (31:6), assigns a ceremony of covenant renewal (31:10-13), commissions Joshua as his successor (31:7-8), and warns Israel of impending apostasy (31:16-18). Deuteronomy 32 expands on such themes, expounding the nature of Israel's idolatry, and emphasizing the life/death situation predicated upon obedience to YHWH; in terms of genre, it may well itself exhibit a testamentary flavour.<sup>33</sup> The blessing of the tribes (33:5-29), akin to Jacob's valediction of Gen 49, reflects the customary pre-mortem blessing of the next generation, and Deut 34 closes the narrative with the report of Moses' death (34:5-8), the formal notification of Joshua's succession (34:9) and the eulogizing praise of Moses (34:10-12).

---

<sup>30</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (SBT 9; trans. David Stalker; London: SCM, 1953), 70, also Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 21-23; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 4-6; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 9-10. Styled as a quasi-Mosaic testament, 1Q22 borrows motifs from all parts of Deuteronomy.

<sup>31</sup> Thomas W. Mann, *The Book of the Torah: The Narrative Integrity of the Pentateuch* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1988), 146, my emphasis.

<sup>32</sup> J. Priest, "Testament of Moses," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 923 describes the Testament of Moses as a "virtual rewriting" of Deut 31-34. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 29 attributes a similar designation, but calls the text the Assumption of Moses. Robert A. Kugler, "Testaments," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (ed. D. A. Carson, et al.; WUNT 2.140; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001), 194 correctly observes that chapters 31-32 are the primary source of the Testament's material. Although sceptical as to the extent of Deut 31-34's function in the text, Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 119-121 still understands it primarily as farewell discourse.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Weitzman, "Allusion," 56: "the song – recited by Moses just before his death – may have been regarded as a literary model for the dying words of the pious."

The farewell address (FA) or testamentary genre (διαθήκη) has several NT occurrences (John 13-17, Acts 20, Luke 22, Mark 13) and is generally thought to mirror such testamentary discourses within both biblical (1 Macc 2) and Hellenistic literature (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which designate themselves as διαθήκαι).<sup>34</sup> The διαθήκη recorded an individual's inspirational and insightful last words, and would characteristically include other-worldly insights, ethical teaching, distribution of inheritance, transmission of power, and predictions of the future.<sup>35</sup> Its primary thrust was paraenetic.<sup>36</sup> The testamentary form is prevalent in the OT farewell addresses (Gen 49, Deut 31-34, 1 Sam 12),<sup>37</sup> which, although not normally classified lexically as διαθήκαι,<sup>38</sup> exhibit many of the same characteristics, especially the transfer of authority such that the next generation might survive their leader's death.

Our contention is that Hebrews mirrors this approach. It shares a number of the genre's characteristics that make the label 'testamentary' (διαθήκη) an appropriate designation for the letter, particularly as covenant (διαθήκη) forms such a fundamental aspect of its discourse. Hebrews echoes Deuteronomy's fusion of covenant renewal and farewell testament, transferring authority from one figure to another, forged around the inauguration of the NC era.<sup>39</sup>

Testaments traditionally function within narrative discourse and normally require a deathbed scene in which the hero's passing is either imminent (John 13-17) or anticipated (Acts 20). Collins counsels against constructing the genre from

---

<sup>34</sup> See William S. Kurz, *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990), 16-32.

<sup>35</sup> Anitra Bingham Kolenkow, "The Literary Genre 'Testament'," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 259-67; J.J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1984), 325-39.

<sup>36</sup> H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'* (SVTP 6; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 6: "In all instances of testaments, the emphasis lies undeniably upon the paraenesis." See further, 6-12.

<sup>37</sup> Collins, "Testaments," 325.

<sup>38</sup> We shall argue below that, because of Deut 29-34's covenant renewal context, Deut 31-34 is classed/labelled as a διαθήκη.

<sup>39</sup> For similar evidence of covenant/farewell interplay in the 4<sup>th</sup> gospel, see Rekha M. Chennattu, *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006), 66-88. She draws parallels with the Deuteronomic farewell of Moses, but not exclusively so.

content, deeming instead that narrative context attests formal classification.<sup>40</sup> Hebrews lacks a deathbed narrative scenario, and, as the death of the protagonist (Christ/Son) does not signal his demise, but rather his perfection, exaltation and *de facto* vindication, it cannot be described generically as a farewell speech. The author/speaker is also not the testator; he instead declares the transfer of authority to Christ who has already died, and whose own 'testament' is a once-for-all efficacious sacrifice. Hebrews consequently lacks the genre's characteristic sombreness and lament for the moribund hero; it instead celebrates the old covenant's demise and accompanying transfer of authority.

These caveats noted, the letter nonetheless resonates strongly with themes and motifs common to the testamentary tradition. Hebrews 1:1-2 announces an eschatological shift in the divine economy, in tones that anticipate the theme of the transfer of leadership from the prophets to the Son. Commenting upon the farewell address of John 17, Käsemann depicts 'testament' not in legal terminology, but rather as "a final declaration of the will of the one whose proper place is with the Father in heaven and whose word is meant to be heard on earth."<sup>41</sup> He hints at a possible association with Hebrews, whose similar appeal to the authority of one who is already seated in the heavenly realm makes the 'testamentary' case for the letter more plausible.

The letter's valedictory character is also commensurate with Hebrews' λόγος παρακλήσεως self-appellation (13:22). The designation is used of Paul's synagogue address in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:15), and, drawing on this affinity, Wills argues for 'word of exhortation' being a specific form of synagogue homily that exhibits a three-fold structure of exempla/conclusion/exhortation.<sup>42</sup> He also finds the formula operative within Hebrews, but in regular cyclical repetitions rather than the single cycle of Acts 13.<sup>43</sup> Wills denies the form derives from the LXX, yet interestingly

---

<sup>40</sup> Collins, "Testaments," 325-26.

<sup>41</sup> Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (NTL; London: SCM, 1968), 6-7.

<sup>42</sup> Wills, "Form," 278-83. C. Clifton Black, "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Reponse to Lawrence Wills," *HTR* 81 (1988): 1-18 endorses Wills' general thesis but challenges his conclusion that the 'word of exhortation' lacks origins within Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions.

<sup>43</sup> The tripartite motif characterised by the word of exhortation should not be confused with the tripartite assessment of Hebrews' overall structure by *inter alia* Nauck and Michel (and implicit in the theological discussion of Hans Hübner, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen:

cites Deut 29-30 as a possible unique incidence of it: "(i)n the speeches regarding the establishment of the covenant there is sometimes an ordering of elements that is similar to the exempla/conclusion/exhortation division."<sup>44</sup> Whilst an argument for formal dependency between the genres would be an overstatement, Wills' observation draws a possible association or structural affinity between the process of covenant renewal (διαθήκη) and the declaration of a λόγος παρακλήσεως. Further evidence for the affinity is provided by Wills' proposal that the 'word of exhortation' mirrors the tripartite homiletic form identified by Collins as occurring within the Testaments (theme/illustration/exhortation).<sup>45</sup> Collins himself compares the testamentary tripartite framework with the encouragements to faithfulness in Heb 11-12, and this provides further evidence to link Hebrews with the διαθήκη form.<sup>46</sup>

Similar affinities may be found within the milieu of Hellenistic rhetoric. Although παράκλησις elsewhere in the letter broadly means 'exhortation' (12:5), the word can convey the sense of 'consolation' and, in assessing Hebrews' overall sermon strategy, Swetnam describes the text as a "homily of consolation."<sup>47</sup> Schmitz similarly contends that Hebrews corporately expresses the full semantic range of παράκλησις, both "exhortation *and* comfort."<sup>48</sup> If 'comfort' is part of the letter's broad paraenesis, then comparison with the "paramythetic" form in Menander may be apposite. The style's title (=παράμυθία) suggests it is characteristically consolatory and it is regularly found in epistolary contexts.<sup>49</sup> Menander himself classifies the form as epideictic, and proposes that it was particularly used within funeral orations as a means of consoling the bereaved by affirming the heavenward presence of their departed relative (*Men.* 2.9). Kennedy denies that the OT farewell addresses like Deut 31-34 fulfilled the role of 'consolation,' but he does attribute the label to John 13-17, a passage he similarly suggests is amenable to the valedictory

---

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990-1995), 3.19-60. Wills' λόγος παρακλήσεως formula functions cyclically at a micro level, and does not contribute to the letter's macro-structure.

<sup>44</sup> Wills, "Form," 293.

<sup>45</sup> Wills, "Form," 294; John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 158-59.

<sup>46</sup> Collins, *Athens*, 159.

<sup>47</sup> Swetnam, "Literary," 268.

<sup>48</sup> Schmitz, "Παρακαλέω, Παράκλησις," *TDNT* 5:773-99, my emphasis.

<sup>49</sup> George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1984), 76.

designation.<sup>50</sup> Implicit in Kennedy's argument is that the FA and the 'word of consolation' – both species of epideictic material – are close cousins, sharing common themes and content. It is unsurprising then that Olbricht roots Hebrews rhetorically within the funeral oration genre;<sup>51</sup> whilst he may overstate their formal generic comparisons, there is nonetheless a strong resonance between the eulogizing of Christ found in funeral orations and that found within Hebrews.

If Hebrews demonstrates valedictory character through its identification as both διαθήκη and λόγος παρακλήσεως, it remains to be seen whether the letter's content bears this out. William S. Kurz sets out the primary constituent elements of the biblical FA,<sup>52</sup> and, using his categories, we attempt to investigate whether there is sufficient 'farewell' material in Hebrews for it to qualify for the testamentary designation.

**a) Notice of impending death:** Kurz attributes the origin of this criterion to the OT farewell discourse (cf. Deut 31:2; 1 Macc 2:49), yet it is not always characteristic of the identified NT examples; it is only implicit in Acts 20 (cf. 20:22-24, 38) and no concrete mention of Jesus' death is made in Mark 13. Notice of death is not explicitly required, but is presumed by narrative context. Within the classic farewell address genre, the orator himself is the figure whose death the discourse anticipates, but Hebrews prohibits this, as the author foresees an imminent meeting with the audience (13:23; cf. 13:19). Likewise, whilst Christ's death is a focal point for the letter, its very completeness and prior efficacy is central to Hebrews' doctrinal import, rendering it incompatible with any motif of impending death.

It is possible, however, that Hebrews' borrowing of the FA metaphor is more subtle than this. The requisite impending death is not that of a human, but rather of the old covenant (8:13); the death of Christ has terminated any cultic efficacy of the Law (10:18), whose works are effectively dead (νεκρῶν ἔργων (6:1, 9:14))<sup>53</sup> and

---

<sup>50</sup> Kennedy, *Rhetorical*, 77.

<sup>51</sup> Olbricht, "Amplification," 375-87.

<sup>52</sup> Kurz, *Farewell*, 32. His categories are not exhaustive, neither does he depict them as such, but he does propose that they are exhibited within the primary FA discourses. We have omitted "Notice of death & burial" from the list, as it is absent from other NT FAs (notably Acts 20).

<sup>53</sup> Such works are often understood as sinful acts with mortal consequences (i.e. NIV: "works that lead to death"; cf. Heb 10:3-4). Their performance requires repentance (6:1) – cf. F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 139-40; Koester, *Hebrews*, 304-05; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 315-16. However, if Hebrews intended a purely telic rendering, one might have expected a more explicit syntax (cf. 6:1 – πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν). The specifically adjectival use of νεκρός (6:1) attributes a particular quality or status to the works that is as

whose future is now moribund. Although the death of Christ has certainly occurred and the strength of ἀθέτησις (7:18 – 'cancellation') should not be underestimated, Hebrews restrains from pronouncing the absolute demise of the old covenant,<sup>54</sup> instead announcing its imminent and effective destruction (10:9).<sup>55</sup> The (non)-efficacy of the cult has been revealed and its existence within the contemporary world awaits an impending death, perhaps via the destruction of the Temple.<sup>56</sup> Because of the forthcoming death, the writer can both appeal to the imminence of the Parousia (ἐγγίζουσιν – 10:25) and describe the apostate individual as 'near cursing' (κατάρσας ἐγγύς – 6:8). Judgment is conceptually imminent, but not yet fulfilled.

**b) Summoning of successors:** Of Kurz's criteria, this one perhaps has least resonance for Hebrews, and is somewhat anachronistic for an epistolary context. It functions primarily within the narrative context of the farewell address, in order to create a receptive audience, in anticipation of their being commissioned as successors of the ministry. Hebrews 12:1 may be relevant for its notion of a stadium audience, but contextually, they are observers and witnesses, rather than direct participants, and are not formally addressed by the author.

**c) Prophecies & warnings about the future, especially future apostasy:** It is in this and the subsequent category that Hebrews most prominently evinces valedictory material, especially in relation to its warnings against apostasy.<sup>57</sup> Within the FA paradigm, the threat to the community may be either internal (Acts 20:29) or external (Acts 20:30), and Hebrews attests both possibilities. On the one hand, outside forces potentially disrupt the life of the community. The audience is warned against the fatal attractions of ceremonial foods (13:9) and strange teachings (13:9),

---

much ontological as teleological. As well as leading to death, the acts themselves are 'dead', and signal the demise of the covenantal order of which they are comprised. Jewett, *Letters*, 94-95 acknowledges that "Hebrews denotes them (i.e. the works) as essentially dead", but his appeal to a Pauline-sourced faith/works dichotomy in 6:1 is unpersuasive.

<sup>54</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 419.

<sup>55</sup> Gleason, "Eschatology," 108-09 notes that the LXX never uses ἀφάνισμός of a steady decline, but always of a climactic destruction, invariably under divine judgment.

<sup>56</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 195-96. Cf. Gordon, *Hebrews*, 94 on 8:13: "it would be a strangely disinterested comment by an otherwise interested party if it were not also a comment on the imminent fate of the Jerusalem cultus."

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Gheorgita, *Role*, 107: "The negligible frequency with which the epistle uses the verb ἀφίστημι is inversely proportional to its significance in the overall message of the epistle... In fact, a case can be made that the very genesis of the epistle can be traced to the Author's urge to warn the community against apostasy."

and are reminded of their previous experiences of harmful persecution (12:3-4; cf. 12:12-13). They are urged to remember their former confidence (10:35), which was marked by persecution, public insult and confiscation of property (10:32-34). On the other hand, Hebrews is especially concerned with imminent defection within the ranks (10:25) and the corporate implications of an individual apostate (12:15). The warnings against apostasy grow in significance and severity as the letter ensues (cf. 2:1-4 with 12:15-17) and they may reflect prior apostate activity that the author views as repeatable.<sup>58</sup>

**d) God's promises for the future:** The counterpoint to warnings of apostasy and potential persecution is the affirmation that God will reward those who faithfully press forward; they will ultimately share in the heavenly assembly (12:22-24) and reach the expected heavenly city (13:14). The writer elucidates the benefits awaiting the believer (10:35-39; 11:39-40, 12:11, 12:28), but does so in terms of YHWH's characteristic faithfulness in making those promises (6:13-20). Although this occurs primarily within the future-orientated paraenetic passages, it is also manifest within the doctrinal sections, where the full dimension of Christ's sacrifice is realised (cf. 9:27-28) and Jesus' status as high priest is founded on the faithfulness of a divine oath (7:20-22).

**e) Exhortation to the successors to do and pass on the instructions:** The letter is replete with hortatory language requiring action (cf. 13:1-6), and, as we have already seen, its discussion of the covenant theme is as much practical as theoretical;<sup>59</sup> it does not suffice merely to outline the doctrine of the NC, it must also be embraced or 'done.' Covenant theology and paraenesis are inextricably intertwined. Hebrews also laments that its audience have yet to become teachers (5:12). He apparently expects their message to go beyond the community and to possess an ongoing function.

**f) Reference to 'deeds of the fathers':** Kurz derives this category from 1 Macc 2:51,<sup>60</sup> a characteristic FA text whose similarities with Heb 11 are well documented.<sup>61</sup> Hebrews' appeal to the predecessors is both positive (11:4-38) and

---

<sup>58</sup> Stephen G. Wilson, *Leaving the Fold: Apostates and Defectors in Antiquity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 71-72.

<sup>59</sup> See 4.1.

<sup>60</sup> Kurz, *Farewell*, 26.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 41-43.

negative (3:7-19), and, as we shall see below, its recounting of the past is an integral aspect of the letter's rhetoric. It is also notable that this criterion is lacking in other NT farewell addresses, but is present within Hebrews.

**g) Naming authorities and commissioning them:** Hebrews affirms the authority of the community leaders (13:17) as models of life and faith (13:7), but the Son remains the ultimate source of authority, as power has now been passed to him (cf. 1:2-4). He is not so much commissioned within the address (though cf. 1:5, 3:2, 5:5), but his right to hold that position is expounded. He himself announced the salvation (2:3) and has become a high priest in the order of Melchizedek (5:10), has been crowned with glory and honour (2:9) and has sat down at the right hand of YHWH (1:3, 12:2). It is he who now has focal authority (12:2-3) and who is their great Shepherd (13:20). He is their captain-pioneer (2:10, 12:2), who provides the ultimate model of faith (12:2) and who holds the status of firstborn Son (1:5-6).

**h) Prayers/blessings/curses:** We have discussed above the way in which blessing and curses operate covenantally within the letter as a means of elucidating the benefits and costs of obedience to the new covenant (6:7-8, 10:29, 12:14-17). But the author, in customary epistolary fashion, also prays for and blesses the community (13:20-21, 25), in a tone suggestive of a former leader affectionate for his congregation (6:9, 13:22).

**i) Succession:** Kurz contends that "the primary function of the biblical version of the farewell address genre is to describe and promote transition from original leaders like Jesus, Moses, David and Paul to their successors."<sup>62</sup> Hebrews acknowledges this perspective from the outset (1:1-2) and develops it specifically by marking out the transfer in leadership from Moses to Christ. Moses is highly regarded in the letter, indeed he is faithful within God's house; Jesus, however, is *appointed* by YHWH (3:2), and, instead of their former servant Moses, the audience are now to acknowledge him as their apostle (3:1). It is to him they should go (13:13), and not to their former heroic figures, however 'faithful' their testimony (11:5-12:1).

**j) Praise of speaker, especially as the one to imitate:** As with b), the praise of the speaker normally emerges from the narrative context, rather than from the

---

<sup>62</sup> Kurz, *Farewell*, 50.



actual address, as such praise is generally delivered post-mortem. Hebrews lacks explicit praise of the speaker; instead, as was the case in a), Christ is held up as the figure of excellence and thus the One to imitate (3:1-2, 12:1-2, 13:7-8). The leaders of the community have a limited minatory function (13:7), but Christ remains the supreme pattern. He is "a model of what Christians should do as they progress toward their heavenly home; he is not merely their gateway to heaven."<sup>63</sup>

**k) Conservative, not innovative.** This does not apply in the doctrinal section, but is intrinsic to the paraenetic passages, which re-use hortatory material and stress the continuity of the covenants. In 2:2-4, Hebrews' audience are pointed back to the grounds of their original existence and conception; they are to recapture the enthusiasm of the early days of conversion (10:32-34), maintaining their confession (10:23) and keeping hold of their faith (4:14). Rather than outlining a new paraenesis, Hebrews exhorts them to carry on what they have already done (10:35-16), to continue meeting together (10:25), to preserve love within the community (13:1) and not be distracted by strange teaching (13:9). They should not pursue love of money (13:5), but are reminded that they have a better and lasting possession (10:34).

Our examination gives good grounds for considering that Hebrews exhibits many features of the FA genre, sufficiently so for it to be, in some sense, 'valedictory.' Hebrews elucidates a complex interweaving of deaths, of both the old covenant and Christ, with one death signalling the imminence of the other. The next stage in the analysis is to examine whether this testamentary aspect is essentially Deuteronomic, for if the death involved were merely that of the old covenant, then much of the epistolary NT might qualify as farewell literature (cf. 2 Cor 5:17).<sup>64</sup> If the valedictory context of Hebrews does draw from Deuteronomy, there must be evidence of it specifically re-presenting the Moses-Joshua transfer of Deut 31-34.

---

<sup>63</sup> Pamela Eisenbaum, "The Virtue of Suffering, the Necessity of Discipline, and the Pursuit of Perfection in Hebrews," in *Asceticism and the New Testament* (ed. Leif E. Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush; London: Routledge, 1999), 341.

<sup>64</sup> Our above analysis, however, suggests that Hebrews' affinity with the FA goes well beyond the death of the OT through the Christ event.

### **5.2.2 Hebrews as Deuteronomic Valediction**

Although Moses is still held in high esteem by Hebrews,<sup>65</sup> his demise as primary leader is signalled in Heb 3:3-6; by 11:26 he is subjugated to Christ and merely one in a long line of faithful witnesses. Likewise, 4:8 hints at a "Joshuanic" perception of Christ as the NC 'leader',<sup>66</sup> and Heb 13:5 uses the same hortatory text that formed the basis for Joshua's commissioning to lead Israel into the land (Deut 31:6).<sup>67</sup> The unique designation of Jesus as apostle (3:1) carries overtones of leader/pioneer similar to ἀρχηγός (2:10),<sup>68</sup> one who is commissioned by God to perform a task(s) and to fulfil His will (10:7, 10:9). Ἰησοῦς rather than Χριστὸς receives the ascription, and this may be part of a broader Joshua/Jesus association within Hebrews, premised upon their shared Greek name.<sup>69</sup> Taken as a unit, Heb 2:10-4:11 contrasts a Ἰησοῦς who successfully leads people into the land/rest (2:10-18; cf. 4:8) and a Μωϋσῆς who was unable so to do (3:1-6, 16-19).<sup>70</sup> There is therefore a rhetorical irony between Deuteronomy's depiction of Moses as one who suffers on account of the people and does not enter the land (Deut 1:37; 3:26-27),<sup>71</sup> thereby requiring Ἰησοῦς to fulfil that purpose, and the 'successful' suffering of the

---

<sup>65</sup> For Hebrews' high Mosesology, see D'Angelo, *Moses*, 1-64.

<sup>66</sup> Hebrews does not explicitly exploit the Ἰησοῦς typology, but it is beyond credibility that the association would not have been made by someone so attuned to LXX symbolism and significance. See F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 108-09; Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Leicester: Apollos, 1995), 116-17.

<sup>67</sup> Lane, *Hebrews*, 520: "The writer could have understood the oracle as the word of God to a new Joshua who will lead the people into rest."

<sup>68</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 243.

<sup>69</sup> C. P. M. Jones, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 119 argues: "At two points the argument is only intelligible if we understand it to rest on an equivocal use of the word Ἰησοῦς = Joshua/Jesus." Hebrews 4:7-8 sounds like Joshua, but 4:10 orientates it to Jesus; on 11:30-31, see below. Julius J. Scott, "Archegos: The Salvation History of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JETS* 29 (1986): 51n14 suggests other NT Joshua-Jesus christological echoes (Acts 7:45; Jude 5) and cites a 1962 paper given by R.A. Kraft, which provided a number of contemporary sources advocating a Joshuanic dimension to messianic expectation. The Jude 5 echo, however, is inconclusive as it depends upon a highly contested variant (a 'D' classification).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Koester, "Rhetoric," 114.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "Moses My Servant: The Deuteronomic Portrait of Moses," *Int* 41 (1987): 253-54. Thomas W. Mann, "Theological Reflections on the Denial of Moses," *JBL* 98 (1979): 486-87 contends that Moses' death is punitive, but not vicarious; he suffers *on account of* Israel, not *for* them. They remain guilty, for his death offers no hope of salvation.

new ἡσούς who has also entered into the 'heavenly' land (Heb 1:6) and gone behind the curtain (Heb 10:20).<sup>72</sup>

Hebrews' comparative disinterest in Joshua does not refute this Jesus/Joshua association,<sup>73</sup> and neither does his absence from Heb 11:30-31. Although an argument from silence, the exclusion of so prominent a figure as ἡσούς in the symphony of heroic praise must be allowed to have its voice, particularly taking into account his inclusion in other *Beispielreihen* (Sir 46:1-6, 1 Macc 2:55). Various opinions for this omission have been offered. Johnson, for example, proposes that Hebrews regards Joshua as lacking the faith that would have sought the city of God rather than physical Canaan,<sup>74</sup> whilst Eisenbaum attributes his absence to his being too national a figure for Hebrews' Christian taste.<sup>75</sup> The various affinities we have identified between the respective ἡσούς figures, however, make it probable that "(t)he author's failure to mention Joshua among the faithful in chapter eleven may be the result of Joshua's absorption into Jesus."<sup>76</sup> In Hebrews' narrative progression, "after Rahab he is brought face to face with Joshua who is however not merely Joshua, but the figure of a greater captain who must be last of the series."<sup>77</sup>

The Joshuanic handover is anticipated in both Num 27:18-23 and Deut 1:36-38, 3:21-22, but is most comprehensively articulated in Deut 31-34. Joshua is charged with two tasks: to be Israel's general in the conquest of the land, and to effect its division to Israel as their inheritance.<sup>78</sup> This twofold charge is reflected in the

---

<sup>72</sup> Hebrews 4:12-13 may also allude to Joshua circumcising Israel (Josh 5:2-8) as they enter the land/rest – so Smillie, "Logos," 351-54; Swetnam, "Logos," 216-21.

<sup>73</sup> The lack of specific praise for Joshua in Hebrews is consistent with Deuteronomy's own relative ambivalence towards him. Compare 1:36 and 1:38: Caleb's obedience is praised and rewarded, but no meritorious activity is accorded to Joshua. See Miller, "Moses," 254-55 on Joshua's secondary status compared to Moses. Our argument is not Joshua's relative importance, but rather the replication of the leadership exchange outworked in Deut 31-34.

<sup>74</sup> Johnson, *Hebrews*, 290-91.

<sup>75</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 172.

<sup>76</sup> Worley, *Faithfulness*, 209.

<sup>77</sup> Jones, "Epistle," 119. See also 4.3.4.

<sup>78</sup> Norbert Lohfink, "The Deuteronomistic Picture of the Transfer of Authority from Moses to Joshua," in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 234-47. J. R. Porter, "The Succession of Joshua," in *Proclamation and Presence* (ed. John I. Durham and J. R. Porter; Richmond, Va: John Knox, 1970), 102-32 proposes that Joshua's installation is into royal office, akin to Ps 2, an interesting observation in view of Hebrews' appeal to the psalm and its associated notions of Christ's kingship.

broad structure of the book of Joshua (1-12 – occupation; 13-21 – division), in the dual statements of Joshua's purpose in Deuteronomy (1:38, 3:21, 31:7), and in his formal confirmation in Josh 1. In view of the latter's frequent exhortation, Lohfink terms the process a "formula of encouragement" by which Joshua is installed into office through a formal hortatory process,<sup>79</sup> and such encouragement language is remarkably close to Hebrews' own exhortatory self-designation (λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως – 13:22). More pertinently, the twofold office with which Joshua is charged is akin to Hebrews' own designation of Christ, simultaneously as both general and facilitator of Israel's inheritance. Luther seems to make this dual connection: "Joshua ... denotes Christ, because of his name and because of what he does. Although he was a servant of Moses, yet after his death he leads the people in and parcels out the inheritance of the Lord."<sup>80</sup>

Just as Deuteronomy itself links the two tasks so closely, it is not always straightforward to distinguish between Jesus' role as captain and the inheritance distribution task assigned to him. Jesus' status as a general, or leader, figure, however, remains clearly articulated in the letter. Grogan observes: "Jesus is the new Moses/Joshua who leads the people of God to the promised land."<sup>81</sup> He has defeated the Devil (2:14) and endured physical hostility from sinners (12:3). In time, all his enemies will be under his feet (1:13, 10:13).

Land fulfils a salvific function in the letter<sup>82</sup> and division of the (land) inheritance in Hebrews is therefore intrinsically linked to the reception of salvation. In tones reminiscent of the exodus, Jesus/the Son frees those held by slavery of death (2:15) and is the source of Israel's eternal salvation (5:9).<sup>83</sup> As Abraham's descendants, he takes hold of them (2:16) in their distress; the same verb ἐπιλαμβάνομαι is used of God taking hold of Israel and leading them out of Egypt

---

<sup>79</sup> Lohfink, "Transfer," 236-45.

<sup>80</sup> Pelikan and Poellot, *Deuteronomy*, 43.

<sup>81</sup> G. W. Grogan, "Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18," *VE* 6 (1969): 60, 68. Also Bristol, "Primitive," 93-94: "Jesus is the one who leads the way to salvation, as in ancient days a man would lead out a group of people into a new land to form a colony."

<sup>82</sup> See 4.3.

<sup>83</sup> Scott, "Archegos," 51 ventures that αἴτιος (5:9) and ἀρχηγός (2:10) are synonymous. Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 79 broadly concurs, but suggests αἴτιος implies a priestly function beyond that of the ἀρχηγός. P. Müller, "ἀρχηγός." *EDNT* 1:163-164 does not see them as synonymous.

(8:9).<sup>84</sup> Christ is the πρόδρομος (itself a term with military connotation),<sup>85</sup> who has already gone behind the curtain on behalf of the community (6:20) to make their hope secure (6:19). He has provided eternal redemption (9:12), is able to save those who draw near to him (7:25), and will bring salvation when he returns (9:28). His actions enable those who are called to receive their promised inheritance (9:15).<sup>86</sup>

The dual Joshuanic charge is perhaps clearest in the Son's ἀρχηγός designation (2:10, 12:2).<sup>87</sup> Attridge observes that, in 4:8, "(t)he reference to Joshua ... suggests a typological comparison between one ἀρχηγός of the old covenant and that of the new."<sup>88</sup> Although BDAG accords ἀρχηγός three semantic categories, each of which is evidenced in English translations of 2:10 (leader/captain,<sup>89</sup> pioneer/instigator,<sup>90</sup> author/founder<sup>91</sup>), Scott argues for a more inclusive sense to the term in Hebrews and ascribes it a complete "pioneer-founder-victor-leader-hero" christological matrix.<sup>92</sup> Hebrews 2:10 emphasizes the 'leader' element; just as God brought (εἰσάγω) the firstborn Son into the heavenly arena in language reminiscent of the Canaan entry (1:6),<sup>93</sup> so the Son as ἀρχηγός now leads (εἰς ... ἄγω) many

---

<sup>84</sup> Many commentators render ἐπιλαμβάνομαι as 'help,' rather than 'take hold of,' on the basis of βοηθέω in 2:18 (cf. Kistemaker, *Exposition*, 76; also NRSV, NASB, NIV). The prior exodus theme of 2:10f (especially 2:14-15) and the similar use in 8:9 make 'take hold of' a more probable reading – cf. Attridge, *Epistle*, 94.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Wis. 12:8.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Irenaeus *Frag.* xix: "it was proper that Moses should lead the people out of Egypt, but that Jesus (Joshua) should lead them into the inheritance."

<sup>87</sup> On the semantic domain of ἀρχηγός, see Peterson, *Hebrews*, 57-58.

<sup>88</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 130. He continues that the typology "is not exploited here," but *pace* Attridge, the broad leadership handover context suggests that the association is strongly promoted.

<sup>89</sup> Leader – JB; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 60-61. Captain – KJV; A. Bruce, *Epistle*, 92. George Johnston, "Christ as Archegos," *NTS* 27 (1981): 383-84 opts for the variant 'prince', with its messianic/Davidic overtones.

<sup>90</sup> NRSV, F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 77n50; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 32; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 161; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 56-57; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 112; Hughes, *Commentary*, 100; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 31; Raymond Brown, *The Message of Hebrews: Christ above All* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1982), 58.

<sup>91</sup> NASB, NIV, Hagner, *Hebrews*, 50; Kistemaker, *Exposition*, 70; Robinson, *Epistle*, 19.

<sup>92</sup> Scott, "Archegos," 47-54. See also Colijn, "Soteriology," 581-582: Christ "leads believers on the path of salvation as Joshua led the Israelites into the promised land. His leadership makes possible the successful journey of those who follow him." Dunnill, *Covenant*, 142 draws together several semantic possibilities for ἀρχηγός and subsequently connects them with Joshua: "Joshua (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) is still ready as pioneer (ἀρχηγός) to lead his people into the Land." For a dissenting view on the relationship between ἀρχηγός and Joshua, see Vanhoye, *Situation*, 316-17.

<sup>93</sup> Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 73 associates ἀρχηγός with first-born, but appeals to 1:5 not 1:6.

other sons into a glorious new eisodus/conquest (2:10).<sup>94</sup> But he is also the author/initiator of the salvific work (12:2), the one who makes salvation accessible to the faithful.<sup>95</sup> If, with Scott, one understands Hebrews' use of ἀρχηγός as a broad unity, then the term embraces Christ's dual Joshuanic function, both the captain of the NC community and the one who likewise discharges their salvation inheritance.<sup>96</sup> Αρχηγός may therefore function reciprocally with ἀρχιερεύς,<sup>97</sup> and Bruce long ago suggested that the latter is Aaronic and the former Mosaic.<sup>98</sup> We might extend the analogy and propose that ἀρχηγός encapsulates the quasi-Joshuanic work of Christ as leader-author, distinct from, but complementary to, his cultic role as Melchizedekian high-priest.

The handover context of Deut 31 may be taken one stage further. Alongside Joshua's trailblazing role, YHWH himself will go ahead of Israel (προπορεύομαι) to secure their inheritance (κατακληρονομέω), just as Jesus is the πρόδρομος (6:20) who secures the inheritance for the heirs of the promise (κληρονομέω – 6:12; cf. 9:15). As YHWH and Joshua are both described in the same 'foregoing' terms (ὁ προπορευόμενος – 31:3), Hebrews has conceivably picked up on this association and applied it christologically to the action of Jesus, who is both the new Joshua and the one who acts for YHWH (κύριος).<sup>99</sup> This association is endorsed by Deut 31:7-8 LXX, whose Greek form conforms to 31:3 and juxtaposes Ἰησοῦς with YHWH as

---

<sup>94</sup> See A. Bruce, *Epistle*, 92-95, 148-49. Müller, "ἀρχηγός," 1:163 likewise surmises ἀρχηγός as reflecting "the exalted Jesus as leader of the new people of God on its exodus into the doxa of the resurrection."

<sup>95</sup> Gregory J. Riley, *One Jesus, Many Christs: How Jesus Inspired Not One True Christianity, but Many: The Truth About Christian Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 200-202 argues that ἀρχηγός casts Jesus as a leader/hero figure modelled on Hellenistic precedents. See also Lane, *Hebrews*, 56.

<sup>96</sup> Joshua's 'pioneering' role as one of the scouts dispatched from Kadesh Barnea (Num 13:8) may also impinge upon Hebrews' understanding of ἀρχηγός.

<sup>97</sup> If, as suggested above, ἀπόστολος extends the role of Jesus as ἀρχηγός, then 3:1 juxtaposes the two characteristic roles of Christ.

<sup>98</sup> A. Bruce, *Epistle*, 93-94. He suggests that 2:10 anticipates the Moses/Joshua references of Heb 3-4.

<sup>99</sup> Deuteronomy 1:30 also places YHWH at the head of the (theoretical) entry (ὁ προπορευόμενος) into Canaan rejected at Kadesh Barnea. The parallel account in Exodus 23:20-21 merely puts an angel at Israel's head; Israel is exhorted to pay attention (προσέχω, cf. Heb 2:1) and listen to the voice (εἰσακούω, cf. Heb 2:1-2) of the angel (and not YHWH himself), a factor that may have some bearing on the Son/angels comparison of 1:5-14.

those who will go *ahead* of Israel into the land; this contrasts with 31:7-8 MT, where Joshua enters *with* them.<sup>100</sup>

One further observation may be made on the Joshua handover. As noted in section 2.2, Deuteronomy integrally intertwines the commissioning of Joshua with the giving of the Song of Moses; the Song's reception becomes a primary aspect of the commissioning service, with Joshua privy to the writing of the Song and its teaching to Israel.<sup>101</sup> Basser notes the inextricable relationship between the Song and the handover of authority within Israel: "the prophecy of Ha'azinu represents the prophecy of Moses at the exact point of transfer ... Moses' contract, as it were, had been fulfilled and was now given to Joshua."<sup>102</sup> In Israel's life post-Moses, "(b)oth Joshua and the Song, as Moses' successor, are means of YHWH's presence for the Israelites."<sup>103</sup> If Hebrews is seeking to replicate the handover to Joshua, then some form of reference to Deut 32 would be both expected and perhaps even requisite. Its frequent citation and appeal to the Song (1:6, 2:1, 2:5, 3:12, 4:12, 10:25, 10:30a, 10:30b) provides significant evidence for such expectation.

### **5.2.3 Case Study – Heb 9:15-18**

The crux for Hebrews' rendering of διαθήκη is the extent to which its customary Hellenistic meaning of 'testament' is operative within the letter,<sup>104</sup> as opposed to the LXX tradition of διαθήκη rendering ברית. Although the ברית sense is generally viewed as appropriate for most occurrences of the word within the letter, a shift is traditionally noted in 9:16-17. The language of testator (ὁ διαθέμενος – 9:16-17), premised upon the preceding language of inheritance (κληρονομία – 9:15), allegedly signals a shift to 'will' or 'testament' as the primary focus of the illustration

---

<sup>100</sup> Horbury, "Monarchy," 118-119; cf. Num. 27:17.

<sup>101</sup> Cf Deut 31:19 LXX. In the MT, only Moses teaches the Song.

<sup>102</sup> Herbert W. Bassar, *Midrashic Interpretations of the Song of Moses* (New York: Peter Lang, 1984), 260. See also Talstra, "Deuteronomy," 95-103.

<sup>103</sup> MacDonald, *Monotheism*, 144.

<sup>104</sup> On ברית in the LXX, James Barr, "Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant," in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie* (ed. Walther Zimmerli, et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 35 concedes: "it may be that the Greek translation has to be related to specific conditions of Hellenistic Judaism."

(cf. Gal 3:15).<sup>105</sup> In 9:18, the בְּרִית aspect returns, and this has caused some discomfort as to whether such an adept author as Hebrews would make a fundamental shift of meaning within one pericope, particularly bearing in mind the illustrative aspect of 9:16-17.<sup>106</sup> The suggestion is therefore made that διαθήκη should be rendered consistently throughout 9:15-18, either as 'covenant',<sup>107</sup> or as 'will/testament'.<sup>108</sup> Both options are seen as mutually exclusive, the one point on which the most vigorous proponents agree.<sup>109</sup>

The most prominent advocate of the testamentary approach has been James Swetnam, whose contribution is notable for its appeal to a broad Sinai context, interestingly so since the Sinaitic material of 9:18f is invariably cited as evidence of the בְּרִית interpretation. Swetnam argues that testament is crucial for the author's understanding of the new διαθήκη, because a testament – unlike a covenant – furnishes the promised blessings to Israel. The new διαθήκη "attains the perfection of a last will and testament in which the death of a testator results unequivocally in the bestowal of goods on a legatee."<sup>110</sup> The first/Sinai διαθήκη was not a full testament in that it never extended the blessing – it is a "testament manqué";<sup>111</sup> the NC however has dealt with sin through the requisite death, has removed the curses of

---

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Ben Witherington, "The Influence of Galatians on Hebrews," *NTS* 37 (1991): 147 on Gal. 3:15-17 and Heb 9:15-17: "I thus conclude that we likely have in both these passages the only NT uses of the term διαθήκη to mean testament."

<sup>106</sup> Swetnam, "Hebrews 9:15-18," 374-75.

<sup>107</sup> NASB; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 264-66; Lane, *Hebrews*, 242-43; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Διαθήκη in Hebrews," *ZNW* 68 (1977): 263-65; Nairne, *Epistle*, 364-66; Guthrie, *Hebrews (NIV)*, 313.

<sup>108</sup> NIV; NRSV; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 462-64; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 156-57; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.262-63; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 308-09; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 150-51; Attridge, *Epistle*, 253-56; Koester, *Hebrews*, 417-18. Wuest, *Hebrews* consistently translates διαθήκη as 'testament' throughout the letter (except 9:4).

<sup>109</sup> Scott R. Murray, "The Concept of Diatheke in the Letter to the Hebrews," *CTQ* 66 (2002): 56. Others, however, have queried whether the meaning of διαθήκη in 9:15-18 must be consistent. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 463 notes that the anarthous use of διαθήκη in 9:16-17 provides sufficient scope to differentiate it from 9:18 (which includes the article), whilst Gheorgita, *Role*, 143 demonstrates the precedent for semantic variation, with both πνεῦμα (1:7 – 'wind'; 1:14 – 'spirit') and λόγος (4:12 – 'word'; 4:13 – 'account') used in different senses. However, the logical appeal to χωρὶς αἵματος (9:18), prefaced by a causative ὅθεν, suggests that blood (and not just death) is intrinsically linked to the process of 9:16-17, imagery more commensurate with a Sinaitic or cultic dimension of διαθήκη than with Hellenistic legal terminology. As the argument in 9:18f develops along ideas of Sinai, blood and cult, there is good ground to think that 'covenant' is in some way alluded to in 9:16-17 as well as 9:15, 18.

<sup>110</sup> Swetnam, "Hebrews 9:15-18," 389.

<sup>111</sup> Swetnam, "Hebrews 9:15-18," 380.



the law, and has tendered limitless blessing to the community. Swetnam confines 9:16-17 to the Sinai διαθήκη and contends that God did not "dispose" it, but rather made it (ἐποίησα – 8:9) – he only "disposed" the new variety (διατίθημι – 8:10; cf. 9:16). The agent of the διαθήκη in 9:16-17 is not God, but merely dead animals, and "the chief reason for denying that Heb 9:16-17 is applicable to the Sinai διαθήκη fails."<sup>112</sup>

Swetnam's differentiation between a διαθήκη 'disposed' and one merely 'made' is an important one, but his overall thesis fails to persuade. His exposure of 'blessing' and 'curse' motifs in Heb 9:15-17 lacks textual support,<sup>113</sup> and his overall reading of the pericope unnecessarily imposes Gal 3 theology onto the Hebrews text.<sup>114</sup> Recent scholarship has also produced some vigorous critiques of the 'testamentary' approach. In a lengthy assessment of Greco-Roman testamentary practice, John J. Hughes has queried the necessity of the testator's death for the will's terms to be carried out.<sup>115</sup> He concludes that death was indeed not required, therefore undermining the fundamental premise of the 'testamentary' case (cf. 9:16-17).<sup>116</sup> Hughes also suggests that the verb used in relation to death – φέρω (9:16) – pertained to the cultic arena rather than the legal milieu, thus providing further evidence for the 'covenant' interpretation. He interprets 9:16-17 as the "ratification procedures whereby a διαθήκη becomes operative in general" and argues that 9:16-17 set forth a process of "representation." Animals (νεκροῖς – logically plural) are the representatives who die for the covenant maker (i.e. Israel at Sinai); covenant is ratified over the dead, and is never ratified *without* death, from the time of the first covenant onwards (9:18).<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Swetnam, "Hebrews 9:15-18," 377.

<sup>113</sup> We have already had cause to critique this area of Swetnam's thesis: see above.

<sup>114</sup> Of Swetnam's notion that Heb 9:15-18 reflects the removal of the covenantal curse, Attridge, *Epistle*, 256n31 comments: "of that notion there is no trace in this passage."

<sup>115</sup> John J. Hughes, "Hebrews 9:15ff and Galatians 3:15ff: A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure," *NovT* 21 (1979): 27-96.

<sup>116</sup> The legal will case is articulated as follows: "a covenant is an arrangement between related parties and does not necessarily presuppose death, though death almost universally became associated with it. A will is an arrangement of possessions, and has force only when the death of the person who has made the will has been established" – Hewitt, *Epistle*, 150. Koester, *Hebrews*, 417-18 disputes Hughes' point: he differentiates between a gift (*donatio*), which could be given pre-death, and a testament (διαθήκη) whose terms could not.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Lane, *Hebrews*, 242-43.

More recently, Scott Hahn has argued that the idea of Hebrews as 'testament' is both "incongruous" and "inconsistent" with the epistle's depiction of διαθήκη.<sup>118</sup> Christ's inheritance is received *after* his death and exaltation – the heir has to die, rather than the testator. This is both contrary to the classic testamentary inheritance-heir paradigm and ill suited to Hebrews' description of Christ as mediator (μεσίτης – 8:6, 9:15, 12:24) rather than testator. Hahn also contends that the cultic context of the διαθήκη is anachronistic within the Gentile world, since the secular διαθήκη lacked cultic or liturgical referent. If 9:16-17 has any explanatory function for 9:18, then the former must retain some cultic dimension; διαθήκη as 'testament' becomes an impossibility.<sup>119</sup>

Although supportive of Hughes' general position, Hahn disputes some of his conclusions. He proposes that covenant remains central to 9:16-17, but argues that distinctions be made as to the type of covenant being referred to and the means by which they are confirmed.<sup>120</sup> Where Hughes, he ventures, treats all covenants as equivalent, Hahn distinguishes between kinship, grant and vassal-treaty covenants. He contends that 9:16-17 speaks to the broken Sinai (vassal-treaty) διαθήκη and its penal implications: "the purpose of vv16-17 is to explain why a death is necessary and the immediate context of discussion is the situation of the broken first covenant..... If there were no covenant, no death would be necessary."<sup>121</sup> Since the covenant has been broken, the death of the covenant maker is requisite (9:16); it is not in force (or rather 'enforced') unless such death occurs.<sup>122</sup> This death is not merely representative (so Hughes), but, for Hahn, an appeal to the real, non-figurative death of the covenant maker (9:17).

Hahn's position is well articulated and his objections to the testamentary explanation well received. As we argued in the previous chapter, διαθήκη as ברית is a primary aspect of the letter's covenantal DNA and fundamental to its parallels with

---

<sup>118</sup> Scott Hahn, "A Broken Covenant and the Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15-22," *CBQ* 66 (2004): 416-36.

<sup>119</sup> Hahn, "Broken," 417-26.

<sup>120</sup> Hahn, "Kinship", 57-75 contends that a covenant did not require death; an oath is the *sine qua non* of covenantal initiation.

<sup>121</sup> Hahn, "Broken," 431.

<sup>122</sup> Hahn, "Broken," 435 paraphrases 9:16-17: "a broken covenant demands the death of the covenant maker and is not enforced while the covenant maker remains alive."

Deuteronomy. His thesis, however, is not without its own problems. His notion of Christ's curse-bearing death is strongly reminiscent of Swetnam's argument; like Swetnam, its appeal to curse imagery lacks formal textual support and smuggles Gal 3 theology into Hebrews without justification. His premise of the "broken covenant" of Sinai as the prevailing theme of 9:15-17 is also questionable. The word order of 9:15 places λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας at the climax of the verse (nearest the parenthetical 9:16) and the phrase is also the main purpose clause of the sentence. Therefore γὰρ (9:16) more likely pertains to the means by which the eternal inheritance is received than to any breaking of the first covenant, especially as 9:15 does not itself actually say the covenant is broken; it only notes that sins were committed under the first covenant and that Christ's death has provided release from them (though cf. 8:9). The key issue to which 9:16-17 addresses itself, if only parenthetically, is: how do the κεκλημένοι receive their inheritance? To reduce διαθήκη solely to covenant/ברית is to negate how 9:16-17 might speak to such a question.

If, as we have argued above, there are parallels between the eternal inheritance of Hebrews and the land goal of the Deuteronomic audience, there is good ground to think that a broader understanding of διαθήκη is required, one that alludes to the issue of Hebrews' reception of the promised inheritance. There is also reason to question whether the divide between 'testament' and 'covenant' is as acute as scholars generally imply. A primary aspect of the Deuteronomic covenantal process is its attempt to deal with the loss of the primary figure by 'testating' the requirements for the new era (cf. also Josh 24:1-27). Within this paradigm, 'covenant' and 'testament' are inseparable concepts, potentially two sides of the same coin. This distinguishes between the Hellenistic διαθήκη as a legal will and the Jewish/Hellenistic διαθήκη as the biblical representation of the farewell speech that marks the death of a nation's leader and the subsequent transfer of authority to the successor.<sup>123</sup> The two concepts are not mutually exclusive – the farewell speech mode is not bereft of issues of inheritance – but it stresses the seminal era-changing transfer of authority, akin to the spirit of Hebrews' exordium declaration (1:1-2).<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Hughes omits discussion of the testamentary genre of extra-biblical literature.

<sup>124</sup> Swetnam, "Hebrews 9:15-18," 373 notes the association between testament and covenant within the covenant formula, but does not develop the connection in his argument.

Meredith Kline makes a suggestion along these lines in his analysis of Deut 31-34, comparing the unit with the discourse of Heb 9:15-18. Kline proposes that the 'testamentary' reference in 9:16-17 recalls that part of the vassal-suzerainty treaty (paradigmatically that of Deuteronomy) that makes succession arrangements in anticipation of the leader's impending death.<sup>125</sup> Such 'testamentary' exchange functions within the broad covenantal domain and facilitates "the continuity and perpetuation of the covenant relationship."<sup>126</sup> In language reminiscent of Heb 9:16-17, he opines: "A testament is of force only after the death of the testator. So the Deuteronomic Covenant in its testamentary aspect ... would not become operative until the death of Moses."<sup>127</sup> Such testamentary discourse includes and enacts leadership arrangements, and Kline proposes that such arrangements are replicated in Hebrews. He reads Heb 9:16-17 typologically ("Jesus is both dying Moses and succeeding Joshua"),<sup>128</sup> and moots the possibility that the epistle is echoing Deuteronomy's transfer of power from Moses to a new Joshua.

This approach is also implicit in the work of Kline's contemporary, Klaus Baltzer. Baltzer argues that the testamentary genre was an outworking or continuation of the 'covenant formulary,' a literary type found particularly in ANE treaties and exemplified in the Sinai discourse and Deuteronomy. For Baltzer, this formula is a regular feature of Jewish literature and is manifest, not just in the foundational biblical texts of Deuteronomy and Joshua, but also in later works such as the Testaments, the Manual of Discipline (1QS) and latterly the Epistle of Barnabas.<sup>129</sup> It is not possible to address all of Baltzer's conclusions here, and it is fair to say that his work has not received universal endorsement; he probably goes

---

<sup>125</sup> Kline, *Treaty*, 39-41. F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 224n132 counteracts Kline's assessment, affirming: "While the ancient Near Eastern principle of the dynastic covenant is of prime relevance to the Old Testament covenant, and not least to that of Deuteronomy, it is improbable that it would have readily occurred as an analogy to our author's mind in the first century A.D." Bruce's objection may hold up if appeal is made solely to the dynastic aspect of ANE treaties, but the witness of the other testamentary material (TOTP's διαθήκη self-designation), and the contemporary perception of Deuteronomy as valedictory (1Q22) suggests that Deut 31-34 were viewed as farewell material. Our contention is not to relate Hebrews to ANE treaty formats, but to assert that the Deuteronomic text reflects (re-usable) themes of succession and authority transfer.

<sup>126</sup> Kline, *Treaty*, 34.

<sup>127</sup> Kline, *Treaty*, 148; see also John Fischer, "Covenant, Fulfillment and Judaism in Hebrews," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 13 (1989): 178-179.

<sup>128</sup> Kline, *Treaty*, 41.

<sup>129</sup> Baltzer, *Covenant*, 1-180.

beyond the evidence in suggesting that the testament/διαθήκη *form* or *genre* exhibits the covenant formulary.<sup>130</sup> Yet his observation that covenant renewal accompanied a leader's death and subsequent change in authority suggests at least a rhetorical, theological or symbolic (rather than structural/generic) association between covenant renewal and testamentary ideology that associates בְּרִית with the era-changing context of a διαθήκη. He contends: "in the OT, there is a close association between covenant formulary and testament. This association must be confirmed when Israel undergoes a change of leadership." He continues: "in the Old Testament, the stylization of all Deuteronomy as 'Moses' farewell address is an impressive example of the use of the covenant formulary as a 'testament'."<sup>131</sup> In terms of Hahn's concerns over the issue of inheritance within the testamentary paradigm, Baltzer also observes that the issue is not so much about the *death* of the testator, but rather the *life* of the next generation. Such a concern for the next generation is apt for both Deuteronomy (whose valedictory elements follow the exhortations to 'choose life' – 30:19) and for Hebrews' audience, who may be experiencing dislocation amidst the loss of symbols of the old order.<sup>132</sup>

Embracing the conclusions of both Baltzer and Kline, διαθήκη in 9:16-17 is best described as a 'covenant-testament,'<sup>133</sup> a valedictory concept, operative within covenant discourse, that marks the handover of leadership or authority. With Hughes, the concept is clearly sourced from the LXX, but from a specific aspect of LXX discourse whose significance Hughes refutes.<sup>134</sup> It reflects the Hellenistic Jewish material of the testaments, but not the Greco-Roman testamentary model of which Hughes and Hahn are critical. The primary context of 9:15-22 is the inauguration of a διαθήκη occasioned by and dependent upon death/blood. Hebrews 9:18-22 explicates the establishment of the Sinai covenant, treating death and blood

---

<sup>130</sup> Robert A. Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 21-22 contends that testaments lack the link with Torah found in the covenant. Collins, *Athens*, 157 observes that, whereas the covenant formula's historical appeal was premised upon YHWH's saving deeds, that of the testaments derived from the piety of the individual patriarch. See also Hollander, *Joseph*, 4-5.

<sup>131</sup> Baltzer, *Covenant*, 137.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. the thesis of Isaacs, *Sacred*, 15-67 that Hebrews' context is the fall of the Temple and the absence of sacred space.

<sup>133</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 219 ventures the phrase "testamentary covenant" for 9:16, but not in the quasi-Deuteronomiac sense we propose.

<sup>134</sup> Hughes, "Hebrews 9:15ff," 51.

interchangeably, the blood motif allowing the cleansing motif to develop in 9:23-28. Hebrews 9:16-17 establishes the principle upon which such inauguration can happen, i.e. how Christ can be the mediator of a *new* διαθήκη (9:15) that has made the *old* obsolete (8:13, 10:9). The juxtaposition of 'new covenant' and 'death' in 9:15 links these two concepts together, inviting the fundamental premise of 9:16-17, developed by 9:18f, that no διαθήκη is instituted without the death of the διαθήκη maker. If διαθήκη in 9:16-17 is best described as a 'covenant-testament,' Heb 9:16-17 may be rendered as follows: 'where there is a covenant-testament (inauguration), it is necessary to hold forth<sup>135</sup> the death of the covenant-testator. For a covenant-testament is not valid in the case of dead people, since it never has force when the covenant-testator still lives.'

The framework of Joshuanic christology demonstrated above suggests that the author is recalling the covenant-testament handover of Deut 29-34, with Heb 9:16-17 appealing to the Moab covenant-testament moment. The narrative context of Deut 29-34 is the declaration of the Moab covenant (διαθήκη – 29:1), a primary aspect of which is the transfer of leadership from Moses to Joshua; the chapters articulate the pattern of covenant-testament handover, but do specifically within an act identified lexically as a διαθήκη. Israel's precedent for the passing from one (Sinai) διαθήκη to another lay with the covenant-testamentary discourse delivered at the threshold of the Canaan conquest. On Moses' death, authority passed to Joshua; the Sinai era is symbolically left behind and the new Moab/Canaan era enacted. Likewise, under the NC, the death of Christ has marked the demise of the (Mosaic) Sinai dispensation and passed authority to him – Ἰησοῦς – as NC mediator. In delivering the covenant-testament διαθήκη, the testator has not yet died; he/she cannot do so, since they must still deliver its content to the next generation. The death is 'held forth' or 'anticipated' before the audience (cf. φέρεσθαι – 9:16). The διαθήκη only takes effect after the death of the testator (cf. 9:17); within the Deuteronomic narrative, Moses remains Israel's leader even after the prospect of his death and Joshua's succession is announced (1:37-38; 3:26-27). Even after Joshua's commissioning (31:23), Moses still delivers the tribal blessing (33:5-29), and

---

<sup>135</sup> The problematic φέρεσθαι conveys its natural idea of 'holding forth' the *prospect* of death in quasi-anticipatory fashion – see BDAG. Φέρω does not *prove* the death (NIV) nor *establish* it (NRSV); a covenant-testament rather anticipates the death of the one makes it (9:16), in the Deuteronomic case, namely Moses. This makes good sense of the verb's passive mood.

although Joshua participates in the writing and teaching of the Song (31:19 LXX), Moses assumes primary responsibility for its delivery (31:22, 30).<sup>136</sup> Unlike the Greco-Roman διαθήκη, it is only *after* the death of Moses that the substance of the covenant-testament διαθήκη is discharged.

It remains the case that Hebrews is engaging in some form of word play in 9:15-17; there is some development from "covenant" (v15) to "covenant-testament" (vv16-17) and back to "covenant" (v18) that permits Hebrews to illustrate its argument. The wordplay, however, remains thematically consistent with the overall Sinai covenant discourse (unlike the διαθήκη-as-testament argument) and similarly does not require a move to another semantic domain; διαθήκη-as-covenant-testament is merely one element of the Sinai covenant narrative in which Hebrews is interested, namely the precedent for a transfer of Mosaic authority. No tangential argument is being made.

It may be objected that not every διαθήκη is characterised by leadership handover and that our proposal fails the propositional universal standard of 9:16-17. Such an objection falters, however, since Hebrews' wordplay in 9:16-17 invites the scenario of a διαθήκη that is both covenantal *and* testamentary, both cultic *and* hereditary. The valedictory covenant-testament διαθήκη fits this framework (unlike either 'individual' understanding), and is commensurate with the broader inauguration/initiation context of the pericope. Every covenant-testamentary διαθήκη *does* require a death, unlike a purely covenantal or purely testamentary version. Indeed, it is the *only* conception of διαθήκη that fulfils the criteria of 9:15-17: i.e. it premises inauguration of a new era upon the death of testator and also functions within the בְּרִית context.

Interpretation of Heb 9:16-17 must also reflect the other concern of 9:15, namely the reception of the inheritance by οἱ κεκλημένοι. Within the land/inheritance typological framework we have alluded to,<sup>137</sup> access to Canaan awaited the new era – of Joshua – for its fulfilment. The first (Mosaic) era, initiated at Sinai, has only ended in wilderness failure, with even Moses himself denied the full blessing of life in the land (32:48-52). Moses' testates a διαθήκη and Joshua's

---

<sup>136</sup> In 32:44, Joshua is included, but almost as an afterthought.

<sup>137</sup> Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 150-151 cites various examples that equate occupation of the land with inheritance of the new age.

succession is given so that Israel might receive their eternal inheritance (Deut 31:7-8). Both 9:15-17 and Deut 31-34 articulate a (new) covenant-testament διαθήκη that brings the audience into an inheritance (9:15) that the former order was unable to provide.

#### **5.2.4 Summary**

Whilst Hebrews does not replicate every aspect of the Deuteronomic farewell address, it does exhibit a complex borrowing and reworking of themes from the testamentary genre, placing Christ on *both* sides of the leadership transfer. Christ is portrayed as the hero figure whose behaviour, especially in death, is held up as a paradigm of obedience, suffering and faithfulness. His death is efficacious once for all. Yet Christ is also on the post-mortem side as the one who is now leader of the NC community. A leadership transfer has been enacted, a covenant-testament that relocates authority from Μωϋσῆς to Ἰησοῦς echoing the shift manifested in Deut 31.<sup>138</sup> Although Christ has died, the farewell is not addressed to him, but rather to the sacrificial cult whose demise his death has occasioned.

### **5.3. Then/Now Rhetoric**

#### **5.3.1 Then/Now Rhetoric in Deuteronomy**

Akin to (or perhaps derivative from) Deuteronomy's valedictory composition is its articulation of a 'then/now' framework that contrasts the current moment with that of the past. In Deuteronomy, perhaps more than any other OT text, "(t)he key to the future is described in terms of obedience in the present informed by remembrance of the past."<sup>139</sup> The text places its audience at a moment of decision,<sup>140</sup> exhorting them to faithfulness within the land and to the rejection of apostasy and idolatry, premised upon both the repeated failures of the wilderness era (4:3-4, 6:16, 9:7-24) and YHWH's prior faithfulness to them (4:32-38, 32:10-12).<sup>141</sup> 'Now' is the moment of

---

<sup>138</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 134 also notes the parallel between Hebrews' and Deuteronomy's sense of occasion, the moment of leadership transfer.

<sup>139</sup> McConville and Millar, *Time*, 16.

<sup>140</sup> See Millar, *Now*, 67-98 on Deuteronomy's repeated call to decision.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Simon J. DeVries, *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: Time and History in the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1975), 165: "the essential program of the book in its present form is to confront



decision, and it is distinct from the 'then' epoch that has gone before. There are elements here of Dunnill's categories of sacred space/time, but we will investigate the dichotomy further to illustrate the common rhetorical approach taken by Hebrews and Deuteronomy.

The 'then/now' framework is evident in the overall structure of the book. Its opening historical discourse (Deut 1-3) and subsequent historical review (Deut 5-11) mirror the more future orientation of chapters 29-34, which anticipate the new era of Canaan occupation. The dialectic between historical precedent and exhortation to present/future obedience is particularly woven in 5-11, where Israel's history of disobedience is rehearsed and then given almost sermonic application and exhortation in the call to subsequent obedience. Moab becomes the place of second chance, an opportunity to amend the mistakes of Kadesh. The latter was both the "archetypal 'place of decision'"<sup>142</sup> and the locus of Israel's fundamental moment of disobedience; Moab now offers another chance to enter the land and reverse the 'then' of Kadesh.

Along with the repeated use of the deictic pronoun, Deuteronomy's accentuation of the present moment ('now') is upheld by its emphatic appeal to 'today.'<sup>143</sup> The Deuteronomic prominence of σήμερον was noted initially by Von Rad,<sup>144</sup> but has been given more detailed examination by Simon DeVries. DeVries observes that σήμερον is rare in the law book itself, but features prominently in the surrounding paraenetic sections. Its primary functions are temporal identification and characterisation, namely the Deuteronomist's desire to transfer his audience typologically back to the Mosaic era; the longer the distance from Moses, he ventures, the greater the emphasis upon 'today.' Σήμερον becomes the locus for exhortation and appeal, seeking Israel's obedient response (now) to the YHWH's prior covenantal action.<sup>145</sup> The Deuteronomic 'today' "draws diverse elements

---

Israel in a late moment of its preexilic history with a command from Yahweh that is modelled on the past but is validated for this particular moment of challenge and confrontation."

<sup>142</sup> McConville and Millar, *Time*, 26.

<sup>143</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 32-33: "the introduction and conclusion (of Deut 4) stress the actualisation of the past for the sake of the present through the repetition of the word *today*."

<sup>144</sup> Rad, *Studies*, 70-71.

<sup>145</sup> DeVries, *Yesterday*, 164-87, 261-63. He characterizes the usage of 'today' under four categories:

- a) "Time identification" primarily 'dates' the moment, distinguishing the present from the past/future.

together, arranging them typologically according to the pattern of the renewed day of divine-human confrontation."<sup>146</sup>

Such emphasis upon the present moment ('now') draws a sharp dialectic with the past ('then'). Deuteronomy sustains the antithesis by using the wilderness generation as the heuristic exemplar, both positively and (more so) negatively, to exhort its listeners to obedience.<sup>147</sup> The wilderness epoch is the time of YHWH's concern and provision for Israel (8:1-6, 29:2-6, 32:10-12), bringing them military success (2:24-3:11), but it is more often characterised by a generation of Israel that is quintessentially disobedient (9:23-24). The placement of the Kadesh episode at the outset of the narrative (1:19-46) demonstrates its paradigmatic status.<sup>148</sup> Coupled with Moses' death and the failure to enter into the land (34:1-8), the Kadesh rebellion forms an inclusio that stresses the fatal consequences of disobedience to the word of YHWH. Moses, the paragon of obedience, will not partake of the land, partly because of his own faithlessness (32:48-52), but, more generally because of Israel's disobedience (1:37, 3:26-28, 4:21).<sup>149</sup> The wilderness/Kadesh 'then' contrasts to the Moab 'now'. Israel stands at their moment of decision, when they "must remember the lessons of the past and continually apply them to the future – the key to acting properly at Moab ... lies in learning from the mistakes of Kadesh Barnea."<sup>150</sup>

Therefore, Deuteronomy passim, but particularly 29-34, marks the passing of the old regime and signals a new epoch under new elders (1:9-18), a new figurehead, Joshua (3:21-22; 31:7-8, 14, 23), a Song of witness and Torah. The Moab covenant

- 
- b) "Epitome" views today as 'right now' or 'this very day.' It memorably establishes "the meaning of what is happening or has happened."
  - c) "Appeal" is similar to "epitome", but emphasizes what the event means for that day, lacking the memorable aspect.
  - d) "Identifying characterisation," the most common use, bridges the gap between past and present generations.

<sup>146</sup> DeVries, *Yesterday*, 166. This assessment bears more than a passing similarity to Dunnill's depiction of "sacred time."

<sup>147</sup> Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 203-04. See also Burden, *Kerygma*, 105-42.

<sup>148</sup> Barker, *Triumph*, 7-106 contends that the Kadesh rebellion is alluded to throughout Deut 8-10, thus emphasizing its paradigmatic function. Kadesh's exemplary 'disobedience' status is enhanced when compared to the similar account in Num. 13-14. Whereas, in Num 13:1-3, the spies' expedition is YHWH's proposal, Deut 1:22 attributes the idea to Israel.

<sup>149</sup> See Mann, "Theological," 481-94.

<sup>150</sup> McConville and Millar, *Time*, 15.

outlines Moses' demise, his death symptomatic of the demise of the former generation.<sup>151</sup> An era-changing moment is enacted that constructs a dichotomy between Israel's wilderness history and their impending entry into the land. Just as in Heb 12:18-24, the Sinai era is laid in the past; Horeb is narrated as a past event (4:10-14).<sup>152</sup> Deuteronomy's momentum is predominantly futurist,<sup>153</sup> its opening discourse emphasizes Israel's departure from Sinai (1:6-7) and symbolically directs its audience's attention to the land of promise, which is now their destiny (1:8). The Shechem covenant renewal recognizes that Israel's status vis-à-vis YHWH has changed. On *this* day they have become his people (27:9; cf. 4:20) and accordingly face a renewed call to obedience.

This break with Sinai/Horeb, however, should not be overstated, as the distinction between the then/now dispensations is somewhat more nuanced. Deuteronomy does not envision a worldview entirely divorced from or unrelated to prior experience. The past is instead 're-presented' in the present as the means by which the present is informed and understood, and the 'newness' of the Moab/Canaan existence retains much continuity with the prior Sinai consciousness. The text is a re-presentation, a 'deutero-nomos' that translates the Horeb events *geographically* to the Moabite plain, *chronologically* to the close of the wilderness period (and subsequently to (post)-exilic generations), and in terms of *audience* to those who could not themselves have been witnesses of the events (cf. Deut 2:16).

The Moab covenant renewal itself exemplifies the way in which the past is used as the grounds for future action. We have argued above that the Moab covenant is definitely distinct, that it is מלבר/הלך to that made at Horeb (29:1 – 28:69 MT).<sup>154</sup> Weinfeld contends that, for the Deuteronomist, only the Decalogue is given at Horeb; the rest of Deuteronomy's legal corpus is new material, sealed by the covenant to be made when Israel enters the land.<sup>155</sup> Yet in making the case for

---

<sup>151</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 17-22 argues that Moses' death is a unifying theme for the whole book, underlining the implications of disobedience and the need to learn from the mistakes of the former dispensation.

<sup>152</sup> But not, as we shall see below, *confined* to the past.

<sup>153</sup> Wright, *Deuteronomy (NIBC)*, 14-15.

<sup>154</sup> See 4.1.3.

<sup>155</sup> "Deuteronomy ... left for Horeb only the great experience of revelation and the Decalogue" - Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 241. See also Georg Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium," *Bib* 51 (1970): 61-62.

distinction, substantial continuity between Horeb and Moab remains. The corpus' appellation (חֻקֵּי וְחֻשְׁפֵּטִים), whose provenance Weinfeld ascribes solely to Moab (cf. 4:45, 12:1), have a Horeb source in 4:14, 5:31 (for Moses at least); as the phrase occurs subsequently in 6:1, more or less immediately after 5:31, some implicit derivation of the Moab law-code is ascribed to Horeb. Similarly, the decrees and laws seem to have been both already taught (δέδειχα – 4:5) and about to be proclaimed (δίδωμι – 4:8).<sup>156</sup> The scope of חֻקֵּי וְחֻשְׁפֵּטִים in Deut 4:1 is also uncertain; although broadly introducing the Horeb theophany narrative, the phrase itself also anticipates the subsequent (Moab) discourse of Deut 5-26.<sup>157</sup>

Taking such ambiguity between the two covenants seriously, Sinai/Horeb remains – through Moab spectacles – a benchmark for (dis)obedience to YHWH.<sup>158</sup> Horeb "becomes a model for all time of Israel's position before God, at the place of decision.... And by this means the teaching of Moses can be extended to Israel in all generations."<sup>159</sup> Aspects of continuity thus qualify Deuteronomy's 'then/now' dichotomy. Israel stands at the threshold of their promised inheritance and make a new (second) covenant on the plains of Moab, distinct from that of Sinai, but in continuity with, and in recollection of, their Horeb experience.<sup>160</sup>

The continuity theme may be taken one stage further. The heuristic appeal to the wilderness generation is not merely exemplary, but explicitly experiential. In a striking rhetorical reclassification, Deuteronomy stipulates that its audience *is* the former generation itself; even though the whole wilderness adult generation has been wiped out (2:16), the Moab audience are rhetorically included within their number. They have witnessed the exodus events (29:2-3), seen YHWH's great deeds in Egypt (6:21-23, 7:18-19, 11:2-7) and rebelled at Kadesh Barnea (1:19-46) and Massah

---

<sup>156</sup> 4:5 renders δικαιώματα καὶ κρίσεις, 4:8 δικαιώματα καὶ κρίματα δίκαια. The difference seems minimal (MT has חֻקֵּי וְחֻשְׁפֵּטִים in both).

<sup>157</sup> Barker, *Triumph*, 115. See also Millar, *Now*, 74-80.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985), 18: "the Sinaitic event functioned as the prime pattern through which Israel could re-establish in every generation who she was and who she was meant to be." Also Childs, *Introduction*, 222: "By making every generation analogous to the generation at Sinai, the historical qualities of the people of God recede before an ideal of faith."

<sup>159</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 107.

<sup>160</sup> McConville and Millar, *Time*, 79: "the revelation at Moab is presented not as *replacing* Horeb in the life of Israel, ... but as *augmenting and updating* it for the new conditions in the land of Canaan."

(6:16). They stood at the threshold of Horeb (cf. 4:10-14),<sup>161</sup> covenanted there with YHWH (5:2-3) and were addressed by him face-to-face (5:4). They experienced the wilderness journey (8:2-5, 15-16) and have been characteristically disobedient throughout its entirety (Deut 9:22-24). It is on account of 'you' (i.e. the Moabite assembly, not their fathers) that Moses is denied entry into the land (1:37; 3:26; 4:21-22). The division between each generation becomes blurred; although Deuteronomy appears to bespeak two generations (the wilderness and the conquest),<sup>162</sup> such duality is obscured and 'one' virtual or rhetorical people of God/Israel established in its place.<sup>163</sup>

Consequently, Deuteronomy's essence is its very timelessness.<sup>164</sup> Although appearing to recount a genuine historical moment, it rather invites an ongoing present application, with every generation of Israel placed at Moab at the point of decision. The pinnacle of this past/present hermeneutic is Deut 32, where, in the light of the Canaan occupation, prior experience is recast as prophetic expectation for the purpose of didactic relevance.<sup>165</sup> The past becomes the future in a deliberate attempt to learn from mistakes in the land and establishes a timeless witness against present day disobedience.<sup>166</sup> What matters is the 'now'; chronological distinctions are blurred and all generations become one, turning their focus towards the imminent future. The specific requirement to write down 'this torah' (31:9-13) "freed it to become a dynamic witness by which God's word could tangibly transcend boundaries of time, generations and space."<sup>167</sup> It possesses an ongoing immediacy: "Deut portrays the representation of Torah, not only to children of Israel on the plains of Moab, but also to

---

<sup>161</sup> Deuteronomy 33:2 LXX renders מִן הַר with ἡμῖν.

<sup>162</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 26-27.

<sup>163</sup> Deuteronomy 1:39 need not contradict this conclusion; it merely contributes to the tension between the two era's motif and the unity of Israel, a tension Deuteronomy never resolves but rather endorses.

<sup>164</sup> Childs, *Introduction*, 222; Rad, *Gottesvolk*, 60 speaks of the text as possessing "ein seltsamer Hauch des Zeitlosen". McConville, "Restoration," 11: "Deuteronomy is by its nature opaque as regards its specific period and purpose."

<sup>165</sup> Deuteronomy 32 differs from earlier chapters in that the wilderness era is not the primary exemplar; it is viewed in positive terms (32:10-12) and life in the land instead becomes the locus of disobedience.

<sup>166</sup> Thiessen, "Form," 424 proposes that the contemporary singing of the Song reflects the same process of identification as proposed in Deuteronomy itself: "the congregation is to identify itself with the sinful generation described in the Song in the same way that they are to identify themselves with the generation who was enslaved in Egypt and delivered by YHWH (Deut 26:5-9)."

<sup>167</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 136.

readers and listeners of the text at any time."<sup>168</sup> One might therefore add a third category to the two proposed by Dunnill above; just as Deuteronomy begets sacred place and sacred time, it also denotes a sacred *people* – every generation stands as one before YHWH, irrespective of chronology.<sup>169</sup> There is one people of God, one generation, each standing unified at the temporal threshold between the 'then' and the 'now'.<sup>170</sup>

Such unity marks off Deuteronomy from other Pentateuchal texts, particularly from the Numbers account whose events Deuteronomy echoes. Olson has persuasively demonstrated the existence of a "two-generation" motif in Numbers that contributes both to the structure and coherence of the text as a whole.<sup>171</sup> The two censuses of chapters 1 and 26 distinguish between a generation whose fate is death in wilderness and another whose destiny is entry into the promised land. Olson proposes that such a structure opens the text to contemporary readers, allowing them to identify with this new generation, one that "functioned as a model or paradigm for every succeeding generation of the community of God's people as they struggled to appropriate the promises and warnings of theological traditions inherited from the past."<sup>172</sup> Numbers 26-36 shares some of Deuteronomy's situation and perspective (the appointment of Joshua (27:12-23), the warnings about their forefathers (32:15), and the anticipation of life in the land (34)), and the whole book may be understood as exhibiting similar didactic use of the past, Israel's idolatry and faithfulness furnishing negative warnings about the perilous fate of disobedience. Both Deuteronomy and Numbers may be said to speak in an ongoing way to a new generation. However, distinctions between the two texts remain; where Numbers retains a duality, Deuteronomy extends a unity.<sup>173</sup> To use Olson's terminology, the

---

<sup>168</sup> Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second-Temple Judaism* (SJSJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 39.

<sup>169</sup> We thus concur that the readers of Deut 1-3 identify with Israel, rather than Moses. So Mann, "Theological," 487-88, contra Norbert Lohfink, "The Problem of Individual and Community in Deuteronomy 1:6-3:29," in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 231-32.

<sup>170</sup> McConville, "Restoration," 39: "The fusing of generations is the essence of the Deuteronomic paraenesis."

<sup>171</sup> Dennis T. Olson, *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New: The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch* (BJS 71; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 43-198.

<sup>172</sup> Olson, *Numbers*, 198.

<sup>173</sup> Karel A. Deurloo, "The One God and All Israel in its Generations," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C.J.Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. Florentino García Martínez;

'new' generation of Deuteronomy is still the 'old' generation; they have (rhetorically) stood at Horeb just as they now stand at Moab. That experience would be shared by every generation of Israel to come.

### **5.3.2 Then/Now rhetoric in Hebrews**<sup>174</sup>

In the introduction to his commentary, Peter Craigie summarizes the Deuteronomic discourse as "a time for renewing commitment within the New Covenant and turning to the future with a view to possessing the promise of God."<sup>175</sup> Apropos of Craigie's assessment, one might apply it with equal validity to Hebrews. The letter's paraenetic sections focus upon the future, urging its NC audience to hold onto their confession of faith (10:22-23) in anticipation of achieving the promise that awaits the faithful believer (6:11-12). The λόγος παρακλήσεως is delivered so they might have confidence (παρακλήσις – 6:18) to seize the hope that God has promised as they run the race marked out for them (12:1-2).

Part of Hebrews' affinity with Deuteronomy's future promise orientation is the presence of its own 'then/now' dialectic. The antithesis is more acute than that of Deuteronomy and unlike the latter, has primarily doctrinal cause. Deuteronomy certainly appeals to critical events in divine-human relations (the exodus, Israel's election, the patriarchal promise), but it lacks the seminal (christological) event that 'once for all' altered the divine-human economy. Partly because of the elements of continuity we noted in the Deuteronomic dialectic, partly because of its Canaan entry context, Deuteronomy's appeal to the "now" is primarily situational rather than doctrinal, paraenetic rather than theological.

Hebrews' NC ideology and determinative ἅπαξ/ἐφάπαξ motif (7:27, 9:12, 9:26, 10:10)<sup>176</sup> draws a doctrinal wedge between the 'then' and 'now' dispensations (8:13, 10:9); the 'once for all' Christ event decisively divides the eras and ushers in

---

VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994) proposes that the audience of Deuteronomy are to "identify" with their forefathers. He rightly seeks to emphasize the distinctive role of Deuteronomy, but "identify" perhaps underestimates the significance of the fusion of the generations.

<sup>174</sup> Brown, *Hebrews*, 242 entitles his analysis of Heb 12:18-29 "Then and Now."

<sup>175</sup> Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 7.

<sup>176</sup> Hebrews' use of ἅπαξ is primarily doctrinal, but 6:4 suggests practical implications for Christian discipleship because of such once for all action. For the relationship between the impossibility of repentance and the finality of the ἅπαξ Christ event, see Salevao, *Legitimation*, 282-95.

the last days (1:1-2). The abundant use of the present tense in the letter's citation formula enhances the antithesis; where Hebrews exegetes the NC through divinely spoken citation (God/Jesus/Holy Spirit speaks), evocation of old covenantal institutions comes through narrative description and lacks divine voice. The reduction of the old covenant to mere retelling contrasts it with the 'now' of the NC and hermeneutically confines it to the past ('then'). Even when Christ speaks of the old cultic institutions (10:5-7, citing Ps. 39:7-8 LXX), the divine speech is somewhat pejorative and judgemental.<sup>177</sup>

Hebrews' 'now' rhetoric, however, is not exclusively theological; like Deuteronomy, it also informs the situational urgency of the hortatory discourse. Dunnill notes: "it is ... essential, for Hebrews as for Deuteronomy, that the reality of past unbelief and its consequences should be fully in view."<sup>178</sup> Hebrews' audience stands at a moment of imminent decision on which their eschatological future is contingent. They have already come to Mount Zion (12:22); they are about to enter the rest (4:3); and they are receiving an unshakeable kingdom (12:28). Hebrews exhorts them to act *now*, whilst it is still 'today' (3:13; cf. 3:7, 15; 4:7) and De Vries finds this "something analogous" to Deuteronomy's use of *σήμερον*, as both texts concentrate exhortation upon the present moment.<sup>179</sup> Time is "at once at all times.... what matters about the past is being gathered up into the present."<sup>180</sup> Hebrews therefore replicates the continuity aspect we identified within Deuteronomy's then/now dichotomy,<sup>181</sup> although the Christ event 'once for all' divides the eras (i.e. discontinuity), the letter "emphasizes the unity of God's people over the generations, with all sharing the realisation of the promises together."<sup>182</sup> The NC revelation is

---

<sup>177</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 89-133 provides an excellent analysis of the hermeneutics of quotation and retelling in Hebrews. Gene Smillie, "Continuity in Heb 1:1-2," *NTS* 51 (2005): 543-60, however, argues for continuity between the dispensations, with no contrasted inferiority ascribed to the old covenant.

<sup>178</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 143.

<sup>179</sup> DeVries, *Yesterday*, 165. Cf. John Goldingay, *Israel's Gospel* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 474: "They (i.e. Ps. 95's hearers and, by extension, the audience of Hebrews) still live between Sinai and Moab. 'Today' they are in the same position as people then, as the generation to whom Moses preached in Deuteronomy was in the same position as the people at Sinai."

<sup>180</sup> See above – cf. Dunnill, *Covenant*, 135. Dunnill further demonstrates how Hebrews removes chronological distinctions – 'today' is both the creation and eschaton, since Christ remains the same always (1:12, 13:8).

<sup>181</sup> On continuity in Hebrews, see Hughes, *Hermeneutics*; Son, *Zion*, 78-80.

<sup>182</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 521-22.



consistent with Israel's story, particularly its cultic aspect,<sup>183</sup> and its ἅπαξ sacrifice 'benefits' the faithful of the old διαθήκη in the same way as the new (9:15, 10:1-4). Hebrews' audience stand in continuity with the Heb 11 μάρτυρες in anticipating a unified, future consummation (11:39-40).

In both texts, the then/now dialectic is sustained by a heightened appeal to memory. Where Deuteronomy composes a mythic, didactic history of the audience's wilderness experiences, Hebrews similarly "creates a past that has become alive and significant for the audience"<sup>184</sup> and whose scope extends back to primordial times (11:3).<sup>185</sup> It uses memory both autobiographically (2:3-4; 10:32-34) and through selective (or rhetorical) memory reconstruction of Israel's heroic past (11:3-40).<sup>186</sup> Whether the failure to enter Canaan or the yearly Day of Atonement ceremony, the encounter between Abraham and Melchizedek or the parade of Israel's historic witnesses, recollection of past events become a foundation for exposition and exhortation.<sup>187</sup> In both texts, narrative memory is the basis for paraenesis, though with one significant difference. With its blurring of generational distinctions, Deuteronomy combines autobiographical and historical memory, and its exhortations to 'remember' past events anticipate first-hand experience, however fictional. Hebrews, on the other hand, upholds the distinction; appeal to Heb 11's witnesses is premised upon their mythic reputation, not upon the audience's personal exposure to the events described. Indeed, recollection of their own past deeds is viewed positively (10:32-35), and the audience are implicitly urged to recapture the spirit behind them; the Deuteronomist, on the other hand, finds minimal scope for prior meritorious activity on the part of his listeners.

One further then/now observation is necessary. Hebrews does not merely echo Deuteronomy's temporal hermeneutic, but replicates the 'then' aspect's appeal to

---

<sup>183</sup> See Lehne, *New*, 119-24.

<sup>184</sup> Esler, "Memory," 160.

<sup>185</sup> Deuteronomy 32's review of Israelite history makes the same primeval claims, so establishing another parallel between it and Hebrews. See Luyten, "Primeval," 341-47. The appeal to memory in Heb 10:32-34 may also reflect a further allusion to Deut 32:7 (so Guthrie, *Hebrews (NIV)*, 358-59, especially as the Song has already been referenced in 10:23, 10:25, 10:30a and 10:30b).

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Esler, "Memory," 151-71, here following Hawlbachs' distinction between the two memory types.

<sup>187</sup> Johnson, *Hebrews*, 267 labels 10:32-39 "Memory of the Past as Encouragement for the Future."

the wilderness generation as the embodiment of unfaithfulness.<sup>188</sup> The primary advocate for Hebrews' utilisation of a wilderness paradigm was Ernst Käsemann, but his thesis derives little justification from biblical reference, Deuteronomic or otherwise. Rather, his titular '*wandernde Gottesvolk*' motif locates the wilderness experience within a particular Gnostic eschatological framework; wilderness wandering is not a heuristic device for paradigmatic unfaithfulness, but rather a proto-Gnostic discontent with one's current, earthly existence and a corresponding desire for the true goal of heavenly ascent.<sup>189</sup> Scholars have subsequently questioned the wilderness motif's validity in the letter, partly because of scepticism over Käsemann's appeal to Gnosticism<sup>190</sup> and partly because they contended that the motif's scope did not extend beyond chapters 3-4.<sup>191</sup>

The influence of the wilderness paradigm on the letter, however, is hard to escape.<sup>192</sup> The comparative appeal to its institutions and personages (tabernacle, tent, ark, priesthood, Moses, Joshua, forty years) *in toto* consistently orientates the audience back to the wilderness narrative. The exhortation to venture outside the camp (13:12) and the present tense allusion to tabernacle ministry (13:10) also maintain the desert context to the letter's climax. We have already argued that 6:4-8<sup>193</sup> upholds the wilderness paradigm unpacked in the prior warning passage of 3:7-4:11 and evoked earlier by the references to signs and wonders in 2:1-4. We have also observed that the abundant wilderness references in 10:26-31 and 12:5-21

---

<sup>188</sup> Cf. Mathewson, "Reading," 213: "the story of the wilderness generation in the Mosaic era, then, becomes the story of the new community and the focal lens through which they are to view their experience." Peter Rhea Jones, "The Figure of Moses as a Heuristic Device for Understanding the Pastoral Intent of Hebrews," *RevExp* 76 Wint (1979): 96 describes Hebrews as "an expository sermon on the wilderness generation."

<sup>189</sup> Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 5-8; see also Erich Grässer, "Das Wandernde Gottesvolk: zum Basismotiv des Hebräerbriefes," *ZNW* 77 (1986): 160-79.

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Hofius, *Katapausis*, 1-21. C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (ed. David Daube and W. D. Davies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 376-83, whilst rejecting Käsemann's Gnostic approach and advocating a strong Jewish eschatology for Hebrews, still endorses his assessment of the audience as "*wandernde Gottesvolk*."

<sup>191</sup> E.g. Löhr, *Umkehr*, 289n755.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 170-75. Lane, *Hebrews*, 89: "A major theme in Hebrews is that the Christians are the people of God who, like the generation in the desert, experience the tensions of an interim existence between redemption and rest, between promise and fulfilment." Also Manson, *Epistle*, 55-56; Spicq, *L'Épître*, 2.71-72.

<sup>193</sup> Weeks, "Admonition," 72-80 sees all of 6:1-8 as exhibiting wilderness imagery.

sustain a broad wilderness context, and it is likely that the language of 'shrinking back' (10:39) also evokes the disobedience of the Kadesh exemplar.<sup>194</sup> Dunnill rightly observes that "the relation between disbelief (disobedience) and Moses' failure to enter the land of promise (Deut 32:48ff) forms the major theme of Hebrews 3-4 and provides the theological underpinning for the paraenetic strands within which all the detailed examples above are to be found."<sup>195</sup>

A case may be made that, of the NT documents, Hebrews is unique in this regard. Although wilderness imagery is evoked sporadically in several texts, in Hebrews, the theme is pervasive and central to the letter's self-perception. The closest example is perhaps 1 Cor 10:1-13.<sup>196</sup> Both texts assign the wilderness recollections exemplary status (τύποι – 1 Cor 10:6, τυπικῶς – 1 Cor 10:11; ὑποδείγματι – Heb 4:11) and heuristic value (πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν – 10:11; ἵνα μὴ ... πέσῃ – 4:11), and allude to the demise of the forefathers in the desert (10:10; 3:17). But even here, the substance of Paul's wilderness appeal falls somewhat short of Hebrews.<sup>197</sup> The theme does not permeate the text of 1 Corinthians as it does Hebrews' hortatory passages, remaining for Paul, merely one convenient motif among many. Hebrews also upholds the spy episode at Kadesh Barnea as the quintessential example of wilderness disobedience (Heb 3:16-19; 4:2, 6, 11) and the positive exposition of πίστις in Heb 11:1-40 complements its negative (wilderness) demonstration in 3:7-4:11. Deuteronomy likewise, although aware of a characteristic tendency to sinfulness throughout the wilderness era (9:22-24, 31:27-29), does

---

<sup>194</sup> DeSilva, "Exchanging," 115.

<sup>195</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 131. For Goppelt, *Typos*, 172, 4:1-2 demonstrates the seminal nature of the wilderness correlation. "The typological correspondence is made prominent for the sake of paraenesis, and the heightening is obvious. (We cannot find any better typological exegesis on which to base our proclamation)." Cf. Überlacker, "Paraenesis," 335: "The situation of the recipients is that they are tempted like the wilderness generation to exchange the invisible promise of salvation for a visible, but temporary good in order to avoid affliction, hardship, and suffering from a threateningly hostile environment, that is the larger society or majority culture."

<sup>196</sup> See Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness. The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (SBT 39; London: SCM, 1963), 62-76. Cf. also Hagner, *Hebrews*, 64: "Our author would be in perfect accord with Paul when he writes: 'these things happened to them as examples and were written down as warnings for us.'" As we shall see below, *pace* Hagner, Hebrews' extension of the situation beyond Pauline usage suggests that they are in not "in perfect accord."

<sup>197</sup> Though cf. B. J. Oropeza, "Apostasy in the Wilderness: Paul's Message to the Corinthians in a State of Eschatological Liminality," *JSNT* 75 (1999): 69-86, who claims for 1 Corinthians what we claim for Hebrews (i.e. the new Israel stands at the threshold of the land, but is in grave danger of missing out on the promise). His thesis, however, has no particular Deuteronomic aspect.

invest, as we have observed above, the spy rebellion with a particular structural and symbolic significance. Kadesh's epitome is also found in CD 3, where the spy rebellion is similarly identified as the embodiment of Israelite disobedience and covenant rupture.<sup>198</sup> 1 Corinthians 10, however, barely mentions the episode, if indeed at all;<sup>199</sup> the reference in 10:10 is at best inconclusive.<sup>200</sup>

Most significantly, Hebrews typologically goes one stage further than Paul; just as the Moab generation is rhetorically transferred to Horeb, so Hebrews' listeners become participants afresh of the desert era.<sup>201</sup> For Paul, the wilderness reference remains solely in the third person; the Corinthians never become wilderness participants. Hebrews, on the other hand, blurs the generational distinction in ways broadly reminiscent of Deuteronomy. A 'them/you' antithesis is still retained in 3:16-19 and 4:2-3, that falls short of Deuteronomy's fusion of the two generations into one. But Hebrews' audience still become participants in the broad Old Testament narrative of their forefathers. They re-enact the story of standing at the threshold of their inheritance, warned afresh of the consequences of disobedience. They are still addressed by Ps 95, 'as long as it is called today' (Heb 3:13). They enter the same rest that Joshua could not provide (4:8) and which is now available universally for the people of God (4:10). Language used of the former generation is extended and applied to the NC community. They are not to fall (πίπτω) in the desert, as did Moses' Israel (3:17); where their forefathers failed to do so, they should hearken to his voice and not harden their hearts (3:7, 15; cf. 3:16-19). They are not to manifest the ἁπιστία (3:12) that was symptomatic of the Kadesh rebellion (3:19).<sup>202</sup> It is in

---

<sup>198</sup> See D'Angelo, *Moses*, 87-88. Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 2004), 129 moots some parallels between the hortatory tone of CD and that of Hebrews.

<sup>199</sup> Watson, *Paul*, 371n26 finds no mention of Kadesh Barnea in 1 Cor 10 and thus draws a distinction between Paul and Hebrews.

<sup>200</sup> The grumbling of 10:10 alludes either to the spy rebellion or the Korah incident (Num 16). If it is indeed the former, Paul is comparing the grumbling of the Israelites against Moses with the Corinthians' grumbling at him. Hebrews, however, is concerned with the disobedience to YHWH, not issues of apostolic authority. See Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 457-58.

<sup>201</sup> Guthrie, *Hebrews (NIV)*, 157: "The author suggests the possibility that some among the original hearers of Hebrews were at Kadesh." Also Gleason, "Hebrews 6:4-8," 83: "like the Exodus generation, the initial readers were at their Kadesh." Laansma, *Rest*, 264: "the present situation of the readers is seen to virtually merge with the situation of the 'Fathers' at Kadesh."

<sup>202</sup> Martin Noth, "The Re-Presentation of the Old Testament in Proclamation," *Int* 15 (1961): 56n6 argues that Ps 95:9 contributes to this generational blurring: "the very abruptness of the transition (i.e. to 'fathers' in 95:9) shows that those addressed were put in the situation of their ancestors."

company with all the Jewish faithful that they are made perfect (11:39-40); all their individual scenarios come into one.

Support for this reading of Hebrews may be found in the Epistle of Barnabas.<sup>203</sup> Although postdating Hebrews, with a significantly different *Heilsgeschichte*,<sup>204</sup> Barnabas similarly summons a new generation to fulfil the covenant responsibility that the old generation has eschewed. In his monograph on the Deuteronomic tradition in Barnabas, James N. Rhodes argues that the epistle's writer is a Christian Deuteronomist, who uses the golden calf episode paradigmatically to exhort his audience to future obedience (premised against the climactic 'Deuteronomic' fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.). He asserts: "Not unlike the Book of Deuteronomy, the epistle summons a new generation – in Barnabas' case a new people – to a relationship of covenantal obedience in full awareness that a former one had failed."<sup>205</sup> But at the same time, he compares this "wilderness failure" analysis with that of Hebrews: "I can think of no better analogy for the reading of the Epistle of Barnabas that I have advocated *than the argument of Heb 3:7-4:13*."<sup>206</sup> Implicit in Rhodes' analysis is the notion that Barnabas (especially chapters 3-4) works with the same Deuteronomic hortatory model as Hebrews 3-4, one that does not just use the wilderness exemplar, but also places its audience afresh within the Deuteronomic situation. This is precisely the conclusion we have arrived at for Hebrews, independent of Rhodes' analysis. He concludes in regard to Barnabas and Deuteronomy: "In each case, the audience is implicitly invited to see itself as the 'next' generation: a generation that must understand and come to grips with the failures of the past; a generation that must take upon itself the obligation of God's

---

<sup>203</sup> Bearing in mind Hebrews' homiletic character, it would be interesting to see if there is other evidence of synagogue homilies being shaped to echo a particular rhetorical situation or moment. However, the relative paucity of material from synagogue sermons (the primary evidence comes from the NT itself) makes such an analysis impractical. Cf. William Richard Stegner, "The Ancient Jewish Synagogue Homily," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres* (ed. David E. Aune; SBLSBS 21; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 51.

<sup>204</sup> See James Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background* (WUNT 2/64; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994), 214-25.

<sup>205</sup> James N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident* (WUNT 2/188; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004), 180.

<sup>206</sup> Rhodes, *Epistle*, 181, my emphasis.

covenant."<sup>207</sup> In view of our foregoing discussion, this statement could be applied with equal validity to the shared vision of Deuteronomy and Hebrews.

#### **5.4 The Journey towards a Threshold**

In her discussion of sacred space in Hebrews, Isaacs surmises that, "like Deuteronomy, Hebrews addresses its readers as a generation standing on the brink of entry into the promised land."<sup>208</sup> Subsequently reviewing the letter's covenantal significance, she suggests that "like the promised land which the author holds out to his readers as their imminent inheritance, so the new covenant is part of that future age on whose boundaries they already stand... and which they are about to cross at any moment."<sup>209</sup> Conversely, Hebrews downplays Israel's life in the land; its use of wilderness images (tabernacle, ark, camp), rather than settlement ones (temple or conquest), creates the impression that Israel never actually entered Canaan.<sup>210</sup> We have already seen an abundance of echoes and allusions whose original context, if taken seriously, locates Israel at the threshold of entry into the land. It remains to be seen whether there are other rhetorical signals or structures that support this particular rhetorical context.

Despite the significant correspondence between the wilderness generation and Hebrews, the latter never explicitly says that its readers are *in* the wilderness or wandering aimlessly in it.<sup>211</sup> The closest Hebrews comes to placing the readers specifically in the desert is 12:5-13, which equates the audience's suffering with positive παιδεία of the wilderness era.<sup>212</sup> But as the subsequent verses (12:14-17) allude to Deut 29 and the Moab covenantal renewal, the exhortation not to grow weary (12:12-13) is best seen as pertaining to the culmination of a wilderness journey, rather than its outset. The audience are rhetorically positioned, as Isaacs

---

<sup>207</sup> Rhodes, *Epistle*, 184.

<sup>208</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, 80; cf. Dunnill, *Covenant*, 141-43; Lincoln, "Sabbath," 211. Bulley, "Death," 413: "they (i.e. the audience and the heroes) stand at the peak of salvation history: all of the lives of the faithful have been building up to this moment."

<sup>209</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, 120.

<sup>210</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 143. Though see 4.3.4 and Heb 11:30-31.

<sup>211</sup> William G. Johnsson, "The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews," *JBL* 97 (1978): 245 observes that pilgrimage is not aimless, but rather focused towards a sacred goal.

<sup>212</sup> See 3.2.4.

proposes, *in limine*, in imminent expectation of their promise; the wilderness experience merely conveys a heuristic exemplar, not the audience's current rhetorical situation.<sup>213</sup> The letter's three places of divine encounter all locate the audience at a point of accessible entry, not one of aimless wandering or distant goal.<sup>214</sup> They have come to Mount Zion (12:20); they are urged to approach the sanctuary (10:22) with full confidence (10:19); they imminently enter the rest (4:3).<sup>215</sup> DeSilva suggests how the threshold imagery comprises the readers' current context:

In the example of the wilderness generation, one finds a picture of a group brought to the very border of their promised inheritance, who at the last, panic in the face of their estimation of the native inhabitants and withdraw their trust from God. ... *Mutatis mutandis*, this may well describe the situation of the addressees as perceived by the author. Having endured a period of wandering, ... some of the believers are wavering in their commitment at the very time when they are closer than ever to attaining what was promised.<sup>216</sup>

The threshold motif encapsulates the pressing choice facing the NC community: it is both the point of entry into their inheritance (the heavenly rest) but also the locus of Israel's paradigmatic sin (Kadesh Barnea).

Hebrews' frequent appeal to Deut 32, a Song proclaimed at Canaan's border, sustains this contextual situation. Just as it witnessed to Israel regarding imminent life in the land, so the NC community are likewise 'witnessed' to (cf. 2:6; 12:1) regarding their impending inheritance. Hebrews alludes to the Song eight times and its 'threshold' context is surely more than happy coincidence, particularly because of its intricate connection with the Joshuanic handover. The letter reworks the context of Deut 31-32; where Moses was unable – or prohibited – to go because of ἀπιστία,

---

<sup>213</sup> Albert Vanhoye, "Longue Marche ou Accès Tout Proche? Le Contexte Biblique de Hébreux 3:7-4:11," *Bib* 49 (1968): 9-26 argues that the appeal to Num. 14 in Heb 3-4 specifically locates the readers at Kadesh, at entry to the land, and not amidst the wilderness; see also deSilva, "Exchanging," 105.

<sup>214</sup> Scholer, *Proleptic*, 149n1: "We would argue therefore that the author could just as easily have rendered Heb 12:22 as 'but you have drawn near to the heavenly holy of holies'. He was restricted from doing so on the basis of his *Vorlage*, and the desire to maintain the parallel between Mt Sinai and Mt Zion."

<sup>215</sup> Hebrews 4:3 is a true present tense – Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 109; Lincoln, "Sabbath," 210-11.

<sup>216</sup> DeSilva, "Exchanging," 109.

the Song and Joshua are able to enter. This explanation makes best sense of the letter's evidence: the Mosaic typology; the frequent Deut 32 usage; the inheritance language; and the threshold/entry motif. The (new) covenant community who stand on the verge of entry into the land, do so under the (new) authority of Ἰησοῦς, but similarly witnessed to by the Song. It may be too much to propose that the quasi-Deuteronomic appeal to chapter 32 underlies Hebrews' overall rhetorical strategy, but it nonetheless accounts for and enhances much of the hortatory urgency of the letter and its faithfulness/faithlessness agenda.<sup>217</sup>

The contextual aspect of the 'threshold' appeal is commensurate with Dodd's proposal that the broad context of an OT quotation carries over when cited by a NT text.<sup>218</sup> Our approach, however, has not naively assumed Dodd's position, but rather sought to demonstrate that a conclusion along the lines of his thesis makes the most persuasive use of the available evidence. As we observed in chapter 2, Pauline usage of the Song, especially in Rom 9-11, does not exploit this threshold perspective. It is the Song's specific ecclesiological and soteriological implications – not its threshold/authority transfer context – that provide the basis for Israel's election (32:6-14), their rebellion (32:15-18), the motif of jealousy (32:21) and the Israel-Gentile *Heilsgeschichte* (32:36-43).<sup>219</sup>

Correlative to the threshold motif in both texts is the theme of journey or pilgrimage.<sup>220</sup> The 'threshold' dimension to the audience's situation is perfectly conversant with the notion of a journey that awaits an imminent climax.<sup>221</sup> As Israel stands on the Moab plain, the Mosaic discourse still anticipates a time of further pilgrimage (and conquest) in Canaan (3:18-20); similarly in Hebrews, alongside the arrival language of 4:3 and 12:22 stand frequent exhortations to forward movement (6:11-2, 12:1-2, 12:12-13, 13:13) and the broader narrative of Abraham's pilgrim existence in the land of promise (11:8-16). Such pilgrimage imagery sustained

---

<sup>217</sup> Harold W. Attridge, "Hebrews, Epistle to the," *ABD* 3:97-105 tentatively proposes that Hebrews is an "exhortation to martyrdom," further ground to link it with Deut 32, itself used as martyr/witness song (see 2.3).

<sup>218</sup> Dodd, *According*, 28-110.

<sup>219</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 163-64, Bell, *Provoked*, 269-81.

<sup>220</sup> For Deuteronomy, see Millar, *Now*, 67-98; for Hebrews, see Johnsson, "Pilgrimage," 239-51.

<sup>221</sup> Cf. Salevao, *Legitimation*, 303: "the Christians of Hebrews were already at the point of transition; they have almost reached the stage of incorporation. ... They should therefore keep on moving forward and complete their journey."



Käsemann's appeal to a thematic *wandernde Gottesvolk*, caused him to view pilgrimage as the letter's *Hauptthema*, and occasioned Johnsson's assertion that "the recognition of the pilgrimage motif in Hebrews opens up a holistic view of the document."<sup>222</sup> The motif also forms the fulcrum for Jewett's commentary on the letter, particularly in his desire for the text to have contemporary relevance to modern 'pilgrims'. For Jewett, Christ is a fellow-pilgrim who has already tasted testing, death and uncertainty and is able to model the pilgrim life to the Hebrews and their modern-day counterparts.<sup>223</sup>

Other than Deuteronomy and Hebrews, it is difficult to conceive of other biblical texts so acutely orientated towards forward journeying. Barrett finds Hebrews to be the only NT document that deals avowedly with pilgrimage,<sup>224</sup> and his conviction is difficult to challenge. Although scholars have identified a similar Deuteronomic journey or pilgrimage motif in Luke-Acts, with Jesus cast as a new Moses figure who leads Israel in a new exodus towards the goal of a heaven,<sup>225</sup> Hebrews' pattern is somewhat different. It places readers at the threshold or climax of their travels – there is still journeying to come, but they stand on the verge of their goal, not at a distance.<sup>226</sup> Deuteronomy seems similarly unique in the OT. In Exodus, by virtue of its name, the emphasis is upon where Israel have journeyed from, and less where they are going to; Deuteronomy, on the other hand, is focused upon the *goal* of the journey and entry into the land is the text's recurring theme. Jesus may assume aspects of Moses' exodus mantle in Hebrews (cf. 2:15), but less attention is paid to the sin they have left behind than to where Christ has gone and they now follow (cf. 10:19-22).

---

<sup>222</sup> Käsemann, *Gottesvolk*, 17-20; Johnsson, "Pilgrimage," 250. Though see the objections of Lindars, *Theology*, 126-27.

<sup>223</sup> Jewett, *Letters*, 1-17. Brainerd P. Stranahan, "Bunyan and the Epistle to the Hebrews: His Source for the Idea of Pilgrimage in the Pilgrim's Progress," *Studies in Philology* 79 (1982) argues that Hebrews provided the primary source for Bunyan's pilgrim imagery in the *Pilgrim's Progress*.

<sup>224</sup> Barrett, "Eschatology," 376.

<sup>225</sup> David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

<sup>226</sup> The journey motif is also less concerned with the audience's own progression, and more with that of Jesus.

### **5.5 Conclusion**

Close examination of the homiletic shaping of Hebrews has given good reason to concur that its argument mirrors that of its Deuteronomic source. As in Deut 31-34, Hebrews outlines a διαθήκη that marks the transfer of leadership from Μωϋσῆς to Ἰησοῦς and ascribes to the latter a dual responsibility that echoes that of his Joshuanic predecessor. Both texts elucidate a then/now hermeneutical framework that focuses their addressees' attention upon the present moment as the optimum time for action. Each audience is addressed at the climax of a pilgrimage journey, at the threshold of their entry into their promised inheritance, simultaneously warned of the dangers of rejecting the covenant that YHWH has made with them. Such acute similarities cannot be dismissed as superficial, but rather demonstrate further ways in which not just Deuteronomy's text and themes, but also its very rhetoric and position, are replayed within the NC context of Hebrews.

## **Ch.6: Hebrews and Deuteronomic Re-presentation**

### **6.1 Introduction**

We have examined the interplay or intertextual relationship between Hebrews and Deuteronomy, be it citational (ch.3), thematic (ch.4), or rhetorical (ch.5). We have consistently observed how the writer of Hebrews uses Deuteronomy – and in particular chapters 29 and 32 – as a framework to articulate the rhetorical choice facing his audience at the threshold of their inheritance. In this final chapter, we will consider one remaining question: why Deuteronomy? Why does Hebrews choose this discourse in particular to source its paraenetic and hortatory agenda? We will examine how Hebrews may be said to participate in contemporary debates on Deuteronomic orthodoxy, particularly the latter's closing chapters, and the extent to which Hebrews and Deuteronomy share a common technique of 're-presenting' Israel's story to a new audience.

### **6.2 Deut 28-34 and Israel's history**

In the previous chapters, we found that Hebrews derives most of its Deuteronomic source material from chapters 28-34; of particular interest are the Song of Moses, the Moab covenant renewal imagery and the blessings and curses that accompanied covenantal (dis)obedience. Such Deuteronomic parallels sharpen Hebrews' paraenetic agenda, but, at the same time, their contribution should not be unexpected; they represent the focal role Deut 28-34 played within contemporary Judaism in explaining and foretelling the outworking of Israel's broader story.<sup>1</sup> Bauckham observes that appeal to Deuteronomy's latter stages was entirely characteristic for Second Temple texts: "The closing chapters of Deuteronomy were a regular resource of Jewish eschatology, including those apocalypses which wrestled with the problem of understanding God's purpose for Israel in the light of the catastrophe of 70 C.E."<sup>2</sup> Despite its heavenly re-orientation of earthly praxis and institutions, Hebrews is rarely viewed as apocalyptic; yet its embrace of the Deuteronomic material is

---

<sup>1</sup> Watts, *Psalms*, 74 contends that Deut 31-34 "project the tensions of Israel's future history and, like the book as a whole, present the options of blessing and curse to later generations."

<sup>2</sup> Richard Bauckham, "Apocalypses," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (ed. D. A. Carson, et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001), 1.184.

particularly intriguing bearing in mind its oft-mooted relationship with the fall of Jerusalem. If the events of 70AD are indeed in the author's mind, the appeal to Deuteronomy would be remarkably conversant with similar contemporary appeals to Jerusalem's demise.

Much of the debate regarding Deuteronomy's contemporary adaptation focuses upon the text's particular view of Israel's history.<sup>3</sup> The identification of a "Deuteronomistic" historical schema as a framework within which to depict the fate of God's covenant people was commonplace in contemporary Jewish literature, particularly, but not exclusively, apocalyptic. The concept has been given focal discussion by Odil Steck, who argues for a six-part interpretation of Israel's history patterned upon "das deuteronomistische Geschichtsbild" (*dtrGB*): (1) Israel are "stiff-necked" and sinful and (2) are warned of their sin by the prophets, but (3) reject the prophetic exhortation. (4) Yahweh judges Israel and sends them into (ongoing) exile until which time (5) they repent of their actions. At this time (6), Yahweh will restore them to the land and to the covenantal blessings.<sup>4</sup> Strictly speaking, Steck's framework is *Deuteronomistic* rather than *Deuteronomic*, and his primary interest is the fate of the prophet within the cycle; however, his pattern remains consistent with Deuteronomy's closing chapters, particularly as he diagrammed the schema within the more familiar high-level pattern of sin-exile-restoration (SER). This SER motif is "typical of Deuteronomic theology"<sup>5</sup> and is strongly derivative from Deut 28-30 and 31-34, especially Deut 32 itself.<sup>6</sup> Elect Israel (32:7-14) sinned against YHWH

---

<sup>3</sup> This is distinct from Noth's concept of the *Deuteronomistic* History.

<sup>4</sup> Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 184-189. Scholars who borrow from Steck occasionally change his model; Pate, *Story*, 18-23, for example, reduces it to five stages, fusing together Israel's repentance and restoration.

<sup>5</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 108, though he calls it sin-exile-return, which we assume to be synonymous.

<sup>6</sup> On the exploitation of the Song's testimonial and admonitory character, see Daniel J. Harrington, "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg Jr.; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 61.

(32:15-18), suffered the consequent curse of exile (32:19-26), but lived in the expectation of YHWH's promised vindication of his servants (32:36b-43).<sup>7</sup>

Steck remarks that this model was frequently replicated in intertestamental and NT texts,<sup>8</sup> and a cursory survey illustrates the programmatic use of Deut 28-34 and its constituent parts. Bauckham proposes that "Deut 30:1-5 is the foundational text for Israel's hope of restoration from exile"<sup>9</sup> and elsewhere observes echoes of Deut 29-33 throughout the Jewish apocalyptic corpus.<sup>10</sup> De Jonge has independently argued for a number of key SER passages in the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs,<sup>11</sup> whilst Moessner has found the schemata operative within Luke-Acts.<sup>12</sup> Scott, building on Hays' prior work, avers that Paul's appeal to Deut 32 is part of a broader historical scheme elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, whereby Israel's history is worked out in terms of sin-exile-restoration.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the clearest demonstration of SER's *Deuteronomistic* characterisation is found in the Testament of Moses. Replaying the narrative context of Deut 31-34 and the Moses-Joshua leadership transfer, the Testament is "deeply rooted in the covenant theology of Deuteronomy",<sup>14</sup> Daniel Harrington, in particular, argues for its manifestation of the SER concept via the

---

<sup>7</sup> Tromp, *Assumption*, 121 contends that the Deuteronomistic pattern of history cannot be proved to have come from the latter chapters of Deuteronomy, but could originate, for example, from Lev 26 or Deut 4.

<sup>8</sup> Steck, *Israel*, 110-184. His list includes *Jub.* 1, *L.A.B.* 19, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, as well as parts of Matthew and Luke. For further examples, see David L. Tiede, "The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1," *HTR* 79 (1986): 278-86.

<sup>9</sup> Richard Bauckham, "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; SJSJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 447.

<sup>10</sup> Bauckham, "Apocalypses," 1.135-187 finds references to Deut 29:28 (*4 Ezra* 13:45); Deut 29:29 (*4 Ezra* 14:6); Deut 30:19 (*4 Ezra* 7.129, *2 Bar.* 19:1, *2 Bar.* 84:2); Deut 32:21-27 (*3 Bar.* 16:2-3); Deut 33:1-2 (*1 En.* 1:1, 1:3-4, 1:9). "4 Ezra found special eschatological significance in the final chapters of Deuteronomy" (171), whilst both the opening (1:2) and closing (16:1-3) of *3 Baruch* refer to Deut 32.

<sup>11</sup> H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 53-56.

<sup>12</sup> David P. Moessner, "Jesus and the Wilderness Generation: The Death of the Prophet Like Moses According to Luke," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1982* (ed. Kent Harold Richards; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982), 319-40.

<sup>13</sup> Scott, "Paul," 645-65. For a different approach to Paul's use of Deuteronomy's closing chapters, see Waters, *Paul*, 79-253.

<sup>14</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic*, 105.

reworking of Deut 31-34, chapters that were "an apt vehicle for describing Israel's 'future history.'"<sup>15</sup>

We have hitherto found the Hebrews-Deuteronomy link to be founded on paraenesis rather than doctrine; importation of contemporary historical-theological application of Deut 28-34 into Hebrews should therefore be embarked upon only with some caution.<sup>16</sup> We have also scoped out attention to 'Deuteronomistic' material and, in the discussion of Deut 28-34, some blurring of the two terms can occur. Moreover, the formalised sin-exile-(repentance)-restoration *Heilsgeschichte* has more schematic interest for Paul than for Hebrews. The NC may end the audience's figurative exile outside their promised inheritance, but the grounds for its demise are not, in Wright's terms, the "climax of the covenant,"<sup>17</sup> but rather the fulfilment of typological promises and models foreshadowed in the cult practice of the earlier dispensation. Rather than an eschatological restoration to a prior epoch, Hebrews advocates an effectually different, new covenant whose quintessential timeframe is 'then/now,' and less a cyclical pattern of sin-punishment-restoration. Sin and exile are not foreign categories to the letter but such concepts fulfil a primarily hortatory, rather than theological, purpose in the letter. As for divine vindication, Hebrews remains silent on the prospect of a last-gasp salvation for those who have fallen away. If anything, the evidence weighs against that possibility, since Christ will come again for the salvation only of those waiting for him (9:28).<sup>18</sup>

Some appeal to the SER model, however, may be pertinent. Israel's sinfulness, and the ongoing problem of dealing with its consequences, are focal aspects of the letter. Likewise, the forefathers' characterisation as 'strangers and exiles,' (11:13-16) who stand in tandem with Hebrews' audience (11:39-40), could,

---

<sup>15</sup> Harrington, "Interpreting," 66: the historical bent of Deut 31-34 was a "tendency already in the biblical passage." Tromp, *Assumption*, 121 differs: Testament of Moses "is not a rewriting of the latter part of Deuteronomy" – rather "it is rewriting of Israel's history." The "remarkably few references to the latter part of Deuteronomy" are found mainly in the framework; others are just a few allusions to Deut 32. Tromp is surely correct that the focus of the Testament is Israel's story, but this does not negate the significant point that the story is worked out within the prevailing narrative context of Deut 31-32, the key factor for our purposes.

<sup>16</sup> Steck, *Israel*, 264n3 observes that by the time of Hebrews, the prophets' role has changed; they have become martyrs for their faith and are no longer figures rejected by their people.

<sup>17</sup> N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).

<sup>18</sup> Though 6:6 announces the impossibility of repentance – and for not salvation – for the apostate.

along with Joshua's failure to give the people rest (4:8), be interpreted as evoking a quasi-exilic context to the letter,<sup>19</sup> especially if the threshold language of Deut 32 implies an imminent end to that exile.<sup>20</sup>

The restoration element, however, is the most dominant motif. Pate notes: "Hebrews uses the sin-exile-restoration motif of the story of Israel but focuses on the restoration ... the community of God entering her promised rest."<sup>21</sup> It is possible that the Deuteronomic vindication of YHWH's servants, classically articulated in Deut 30:1-6 and 32:36-43, is the very Christ event itself; where Deut 30-32 anticipated a restorative divine action, Hebrews announces its prior completion. Citing Deut 32:43, Heb 1:6 articulates the vindication of the first-born Son, who has gone ahead into the promised οἰκουμένη (1:6), leading the assembly of the first-born out of exile into their own inheritance (2:10, 12:23). He has sat down at the right hand (1:3), his work completed (10:12) and the faithful will enjoy that vindication if they hold on (10:35). They will be his house (3:6) and he will reward their faithfulness (6:12). Hebrews as 'quasi-Deuteronomic vindication' would also be commensurate both with our proposal that Deut 30:1-10 anticipates the Jeremiah NC and with the emphatic finality of the Son's address (1:1-2). No further vindication is possible; in these 'last days,' the ultimate divine christological vindication has been issued and the destinies of those who embrace or reject it are respectively blessing and curse. Hebrews 10:30's appeal to Deut 32:35-36 would then become a double-edged sword, citing the judgment of those who spurn Christ, while at the same time announcing the vindication of those who embrace him.

It remains the case that the situational relationship between the respective audiences is the common Deuteronomy-Hebrews thread, with both audiences positioned at the critical moment of decision at the threshold of their inheritance. But this rhetorical parallel also permits Hebrews to exploit the heuristic historical potential associated with Deuteronomy's closing chapters. Its appeal to the Song, for example, combines severe warnings against apostasy with the decisive vindication of YHWH's servants fulfilled through the vindication of the Son. For Hebrews, the Christ event remains the decisive moment in Israel's history, but Deut 28-34 provides

---

<sup>19</sup> Hübner, *Biblische*, 3.57-60.

<sup>20</sup> Pate, *Communities*, 206 proposes that the echo of Deut 32:5 in Heb 3 demonstrates how "Hebrews considered the Judaism of his day as continuing the Deuteronomic tradition of sin and exile."

<sup>21</sup> Pate, *Story*, 249.

a contemporarily appropriate template against which to articulate the consequences of this seminal episode.<sup>22</sup>

### **6.3 Hebrews and Deuteronomic Re-presentation**

In his work on inner-biblical exegesis, Michael Fishbane observes:

there is in aggadic exegesis an ongoing interchange between hermeneutics of continuity and hermeneutics of challenge and innovation. For if, on the one hand, the 'continuity' is the *traditum* . . . , the *traditio* is invariably a matter of challenge and innovation – a challenge to each generation to confront its religious situation and mundane needs, to reform its values and heritage, and to renovate its ideals and history.<sup>23</sup>

Such exchange between *traditum* and *traditio* accounts for, and contributes to, the various textual voices within Jewish literature (biblical and non-biblical), voices that are less than harmonious, but which seek to assert innovative interpretations of Israel's narrative within the parameters of contemporary understanding and context. What modern scholars have subsequently labelled Rewritten Bible<sup>24</sup> (RB) emerged as a loose intertestamental literary category<sup>25</sup> in which established biblical texts were reinterpreted in new ways conducive to the contemporary re-writer's perspective. Texts such as the Temple Scroll and Reworked Pentateuch at Qumran, Jubilees and Pseudo-Philo are its among its most familiar exemplars, whilst Josephus' 're-presentation' of (later) canonical material may also be included within its broad domain.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Weitzman, "Allusion," 49-61 argues for a similar use of Deut 32 in Tobit, one that appeals to the threshold context of Deut 31-32: "The evocation of the prophet's song in Tobit 12-13 hints that Jews presently living in exile have reached a similar turning point in history – that their sojourn in exile is almost over and their life in the land is about to resume" (61).

<sup>23</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical*, 428.09

<sup>24</sup> The phrase appears to be first used by Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 67-126, though without formal definition. The term may be anachronistic for intertestamental Judaism, for whom notions of 'Bible' or textual fixity were not yet appropriate concepts, but it remains a helpful classification for modern scholars.

<sup>25</sup> Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) considers it a genre, but in view of their variable form and content, we prefer the designation 'category.'

<sup>26</sup> See Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).



Although chronologically prior to the RB developments, Deuteronomy itself participates in the process of rewriting historical traditions. Irrespective of redactional issues of date and provenance, there can be little disagreement that the canonical text exhibits attempts to rewrite or revise Israel's narrative in a form that, as a minimum, reworks the Decalogue, ascribes the law code Mosaic origin and offers new retellings of familiar episodes such as the spy rebellion, the Transjordan conquest and the golden calf incident.<sup>27</sup> The diachronic process and context of such Deuteronomic revision is outside of our scope, but it is not difficult to imagine that its evolution was somehow allied to an attempt to sustain or assert the authority of those responsible for the various stages of its production. To use Fishbane's terminology, Deuteronomy is the *traditio* to a prior *traditum*, whose subsequent authority gave it the (new) status of the *traditum* for future exegesis and rewriting.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, once established as an authoritative *traditum*, it then becomes both a model for subsequent *traditio* engagement, and also an authority itself to be rewritten or reinterpreted by later generations. Deuteronomy is a *re-presentation*, but also a text to be *re-presented*.

Important in this conception of Deuteronomy's capacity for re-presentation is the work of Hindy Najman. Najman discusses the notion of "Mosaic Discourse" as an important feature of Second Temple Judaism, arguing that its constituent elements are found in Deuteronomy's own re-presentation process.<sup>29</sup> She applies these elements of Mosaic Discourse to later texts such as Jubilees and 11QT to demonstrate the "family resemblances" between them and Deuteronomy.<sup>30</sup> In view of Hebrews' own continuity/change dialectic, and its affinity with Deuteronomic paraenesis, it is possible that Hebrews also stands in this tradition of Deuteronomic re-presentation – a contemporary attempt to engage with a particular aspect of Israel's story (the Moab pre-conquest moment) by interpreting it under the guise of the climactic Christ event. Just as Deuteronomy unveiled the next chapter in Israel's

---

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995), 62-78.

<sup>28</sup> For Rad, "Ancient," 3-13, the re-presentation character is fundamental to Deuteronomy's ongoing application, i.e. the way "in which it has spoken the traditional word of God into a changed present" (13).

<sup>29</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 16-40.

<sup>30</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 41-69.

story in the land, so Hebrews unravels the next episode in Israel's covenantal history as its NC audience stand on the threshold of their promised inheritance.<sup>31</sup>

Deuteronomy is not necessarily the *locus classicus* of contemporary exegetical debate, nor indeed the only forum to which Hebrews contributes. Maxine Grossman, for example, argues that contemporary representation of the priesthood is another "contested category" in which Hebrews engages;<sup>32</sup> depiction of the priestly function "was a larger argument about communal identity and authority, and about who was the true keeper of the covenant." She labels the process "interpretive competition" and defines it as the "articulation of competing claims – to authority, authenticity and identity – grounded in the interpretation of a shared literary and cultural tradition."<sup>33</sup> Grossman also cites Brooke's work on scriptural interpretation as another potential locus of "interpretive competition" for Hebrews, its application of contested texts such as Ps 2 or 2 Sam 7 indicative of the letter's orientation.<sup>34</sup> Both areas are persuasive candidates for contemporary self-justification and testify that Hebrews is operating in an environment of contested categories; our contention is that its paraenesis operates likewise within Deuteronomic "interpretive competition" and does so through engaging in Mosaic discourse.

It is not our claim that Hebrews be categorised as Rewritten Bible, for it falls short of that designation in several ways. It is not a unified narrative, and its dominant hermeneutic is christological; it serves judgment on aspects of the tradition (8:13, 10:9), rather than merely reworking them. Najman defines RB as "an understandable attempt to authorize certain laws and practices by literally inscribing

---

<sup>31</sup> For Pate, *Story*, 249, Hebrews' interplay with Israel's metanarrative is foundational: "It is also not necessary to argue that Hebrews uses the story of Israel as a framework." It is interesting that the other NT λόγος παρακλήσεως (Acts 13:15-41) shares a similar appeal to Israel's story in recounting the significance of Christ.

<sup>32</sup> Maxine Grossman, "Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity," in *Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. James R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 117; see also William Horbury, "The Aaronic Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 227-54.

<sup>33</sup> Grossman, "Priesthood," 117.

<sup>34</sup> George G. Brooke, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 35-57.

them back into Mosaic Torah"<sup>35</sup> and, as we observe below, Hebrews operates in an authority paradigm different from – although not unconnected to – Torah. Defined in such terms, Hebrews cannot be RB.<sup>36</sup>

Yet elements of RB remain on the letter's horizon. Hebrews offers an interpretative reading of scriptural texts; it notes the unresolved obscurities of the biblical record;<sup>37</sup> it incorporates mythical or apocryphal material within its domain; and it offers commentary on familiar biblical events. Within what Eisenbaum calls the "compositional" strands of the letter,<sup>38</sup> Hebrews recontextualizes or reshapes recognizable narratives in a manner not dissimilar to RB. This is most evident in chapter 11, which, whilst functionally an encomium on faith, also 'rewrites' an ordered narrative of Israel's history that offers innovative interpretations of key figures, albeit loaded towards a more Christian perspective.<sup>39</sup> But it is also manifest elsewhere in the letter. The exchange between Abraham and Melchizedek (7:1-10), the replaying of the entry into Canaan (3:7-4:11), the narration of the old covenant initiation (9:18-22), and the revisiting of the tabernacle praxis (9:1-10) all reflect 'retellings' of familiar episodes viewed through Hebrews' spectacles. The letter's downplaying of the Canaan rest is also commensurate with other RB texts' reconstruction and downgrading of Israel's land theology.<sup>40</sup> Harrington offers an alternative common denominator for RB material: "what holds them all together is the effort to actualize a religious tradition and make it meaningful within new situations."<sup>41</sup> Such a characterisation fits Hebrews extremely well,<sup>42</sup> and even if the

---

<sup>35</sup> Hindy Najman, "Torah of Moses: Pseudonymous Attribution in Second Temple Writings," in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 213.

<sup>36</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 121 observes that, unlike RB or the pesharim, Hebrews' primary motivation is not to 'rewrite' or interpret the scriptures – biblical commentary is in the service of christological conviction. One wonders, however, whether one can draw so strong a distinction between Christ as the fulfilment of Israel's biblical story and the Scriptural testimony in whose language christological reflection is outworked.

<sup>37</sup> See Caird, "Exegetical," 47-49.

<sup>38</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 120-121. She makes a tentative, though heavily qualified, parallel between Hebrews and RB.

<sup>39</sup> Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, passim, esp. 218-25.

<sup>40</sup> See Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting*, 116-27.

<sup>41</sup> Daniel J. Harrington, "The Bible Rewritten," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 239, though his concern still remains RB's *narrative* genre.

<sup>42</sup> Dunnill, *Covenant*, 115-260 seems to bear out this contention.

letter falls outside the category of RB, it does not fall too distant; it offers a parallel attestation of the way in which aspects of the Jewish narrative are replayed within a new discourse, re-presented according to the perspective of the author and his community.

Najman lists four criteria by which to assess the qualification for Mosaic discourse.<sup>43</sup> The new text:

1. Is a reworking of older traditions through interpretation.
2. Claims for itself the authority and status of Torah.
3. "Re-presents" the Sinai revelation.
4. Has associations with – or is mediated by – Moses.

We will use these four criteria to argue that Hebrews itself participates, in some fashion, in Mosaic Discourse, and that this contributes to its interplay with the Deuteronomic posture.

### **6.3.1. Expansion or Rewriting of the Tradition**

Najman defines re-presentation as "reworking and expanding older tradition" such that "a new text claims for itself the authority that already attaches to those traditions."<sup>44</sup> Hebrews embarks upon a similar reworking of existing traditions, perhaps as part of authorising the status of its leadership within the community (13:7, 17-18), more likely as a means of sustaining group identity in a time of persecution, uncertainty and change.<sup>45</sup> The prologue outlines the expansion of Israel's tradition in the last days; where God has previously spoken through the prophets, he has now spoken through the Son. A new epoch has dawned that requires reinterpretation of aspects of Israel's fundamental traditions and praxis (1:1-2).

---

<sup>43</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 16-17.

<sup>44</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 16.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Salevao, *Legitimation*, passim; Isaacs, *Sacred*, 15-67 contextualizes the letter in the uncertainty and loss of sacred space following the fall of Jerusalem. Fishbane, *Biblical*, 409 observes that aggadic exegesis is used "to restore covenantal allegiance in its totality" in times of rebellion or apathy. Richard W. Johnson, *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (JSNTSup 209; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) takes an alternative view, arguing that the letter's Levitical critique, rather than enforcing exclusionary structures, opens up access to the community.

In discussing Deuteronomic re-presentation, Najman rejects Bernard Levinson's thesis that the Deuteronomist(s) essentially displaces or replaces the Law Code tradition and establishes a brand new praxis. She proposes that 'rewriting' or 'expansion' is more appropriate terminology, since this recognizes those elements of continuity with prior tradition, as well as those of change.<sup>46</sup> We have already alluded to Hebrews' continuity/change tension, and the dialectic bears upon the language used when defining the nature and extent of Hebrews' interpretative project; whilst Hebrews doubtless engages upon a reworking of Israel's traditions, its concern is primarily 'rewriting', not 'replacement.' Hebrews speaks as insider, not outsider, and terms such as 'supersession' should be used only with caution.

That said, some 'replacement' language may be found in critical stages of the letter's argument. Hebrews emphasizes the 'newness' of the NC, and the obsolescence of its predecessor (8:13, 10:9); the Christ event inaugurated a new covenantal dispensation that is ontologically superior to its predecessor and which sounds the latter's death knell (9:10). Sinai is passé (12:18-21) – Christ's sacrifice has removed the need for any further sacrifice for sin (10:18). Yet such 'replacement' terminology must receive twofold qualification. First, the NC is primarily elucidated within the parameters of the sacrificial system,<sup>47</sup> and the only aspect of Jewish praxis which Hebrews specifically repudiates is the priestly sacrificial cult.<sup>48</sup> Judgment on the old dispensation's efficacy and inferiority vis-à-vis the NC (7:18-19) is focused solely on cultic categories; it is the regulation on priesthood (ἐντολή) that is set aside, not the Law itself (7:18). The priestly cult's demise, whilst significant, is a far from all-encompassing alteration to Israelite tradition, and one which, assuming a post-70 CE dating, was already removed from Jewish praxis. Hebrews makes no criticism of other familiar NT hot potatoes such as circumcision, table fellowship, religious festivals<sup>49</sup> or Sabbath observance, and conversely, it is difficult to believe that the

---

<sup>46</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 20-29, on Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). Grossman, "Priesthood," 119 likewise refers to Hebrews' "rewriting of the priesthood of Aaron and the priesthood of Melchizedek as symbols for old and new covenants" – my emphasis.

<sup>47</sup> See Lehne, *New*, 93-117.

<sup>48</sup> Richard Hays, "'Here We Have No Lasting City': New Covenantalism in Hebrews" (paper presented at the Hebrews & Theology Conference, University of St. Andrews, 19th July 2006).

<sup>49</sup> The application of πανηγύρει to the Zion assembly (12:22) may reflect a downplaying of formal religious festivals inherited from Judaism, but it would be, at most, only a relocation of the festival process.

exhortation to ongoing ἐπισυναγωγή (10:25) did not have overtones of continuity with Diaspora synagogue gatherings. The obscure rebuttal of strange teachings and food (13:9) could be interpreted as exorcising Jewish practice, but if so, one might have expected a similarly robust denial like that directed at the cult, and not the throwaway comment actually made. Whilst possibly a refutation of particularly Jewish customs,<sup>50</sup> it is more likely a general warning against any food that, like the parallel strange teachings of 13:9a, distracts the faithful believer.<sup>51</sup> Grace, rather than food, sustains them in their journey.

Second, any 'replacement' happens within the bigger picture of unveiling Israel's story, the unfolding of the next stage of which is Hebrews' concern. The letter's imagery derives from key aspects of Israel's metanarrative (covenant, cult, tabernacle, Moses, priesthood); rather than 'replacing' such motifs, Hebrews instead 'reworks' their contemporary perception and represents them through christological spectacles. The tabernacle was a ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά of that revealed to Moses on the mountain (8:5), and the Law was merely a shadow of the good things brought about through Christ (10:1). The high priest's entry into the Holy of Holies is merely illustrative (9:8-9) of the true way into the holy place that Christ has completed; ceremonial praxis was only awaiting its time of proper reformation (9:10). Aspects of Hebrews' Scriptural exegesis may similarly be understood as re-presentation – the attribution of Ps 40 to Christ (Heb 10:5-10), for instance, or the christological interpretation of Ps 8 (Heb 2:6-8). The scale or nature of the reworking may have been surprising to many observers, and the inefficacy of the sacrificial system (10:1-4) may have raised a few Jewish eyebrows, but such assessments remain internal re-evaluation, not external imposition. Pate avers: "Hebrews 11-12 redefines the story of Israel's restoration by portraying Jesus as the ultimate expression of that reality";<sup>52</sup> he contends that Hebrews' community are participating in a debate over the identity of true Israel and the recipients of the blessings of YHWH's vindication.

---

<sup>50</sup> Lindars, *Theology*, 10-11 ventures that these are synagogue meals, eaten to encourage "a stronger sense of solidarity" with the Jerusalem Temple.

<sup>51</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 560-561.

<sup>52</sup> Pate, *Communities*, 212-13. Cf. also N. T. Wright, *New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 410: "The story of the world, and of Israel, has led up to a point, namely, the establishment of the true worship of the true god.... Jesus has brought Israel's story to its paradoxical climax." This counters, he argues, Bultmann's suggestion that, for Christians reading Heb 11, "the history of Israel is no longer their own history."

Moreover, Hebrews makes equal and perhaps greater appeal to the *prior* nature of the new tradition – it *precedes* rather than supersedes Sinai.<sup>53</sup> Although the Christ event is chronologically subsequent to the prophets' speaking, and although the oath comes after the law (7:28), the roots of the NC precede the Sinaitic moment. The Son is ascribed agency within creation (1:2) and the manifestation of faith goes back, before Sinai, to the creation event itself (11:3). This pre-cession reaches its zenith in the Christ event and is commensurate with the historical progression of Heb 11, which climaxes with the expectation of corporate perfection of all the witnesses (11:39-40). For Hebrews, Christ is the culmination of Israel's story and the catalyst for a re-interpretation of Israel's self-identity.<sup>54</sup>

### **6.3.2. Torah Status**

Deuteronomy is the only OT text self-designated as torah,<sup>55</sup> in a context that ascribes it an authority derivative from that designation. Both the narrator and Moses call it "*this* torah" (Deut 1:5, 27:3 *et al*), and assert the determinative standard the text would subsequently hold within Israel's narrative,<sup>56</sup> "the expression of the will of God for his people for all time."<sup>57</sup> Moses hands on authority to Joshua and to the 'witness' of torah, exemplified by the Song of witness itself. If, as we have argued, Hebrews mimics the Moses-Joshua transfer and utilises the Song's imagery and witness characterisation, it is conceivable that some engagement with torah's authority is also on the letter's horizon.

Assessing such engagement, however, is no straightforward task. Detailed studies of the Mosaic law in Hebrews have been somewhat scarce, surprisingly so in

---

<sup>53</sup> For Najman, *Seconding*, 56-60 appeals to "pre-Sinaitic authority" are a primary feature of attempts to re-present Sinai within intertestamental literature.

<sup>54</sup> See further Hays, "Here," who argues for Hebrews echoing redevelopments within contemporary Judaism.

<sup>55</sup> Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 8.

<sup>56</sup> All but three of Deuteronomy's references to torah occur outside of the law-book (Chapman, "Law," 30) and thus frame it as Israel's authoritative code for life.

<sup>57</sup> Barnabas Lindars, "Torah in Deuteronomy," in *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (ed. Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 135.

view of the theme's frequency in the letter.<sup>58</sup> Νόμος – the predominant LXX rendering for תורה<sup>59</sup> – and its verbal form νομοθετέω appear sixteen times in Hebrews, with all save one of the occurrences (10:28) found in the central theological discourse of 7:1-10:18. Its prevailing context is consequently cultic, rather than ethical;<sup>60</sup> Mosaic legislation is established on the basis of, and is therefore subservient to, the priesthood (ἐπ' αὐτῆς νενομοθέτηται).<sup>61</sup> Hebrews' relativizes the law's authority – any sacerdotal revision necessitates a change in the law (7:12). Its attitude to the νόμος is consequently somewhat negative; it has made nothing perfect (7:19), and its constituent ἐντολή is weak and useless (7:18). The law only appointed weak men as priests (7:28) and its stipulations would have disqualified Christ from exercising priestly function (7:16, 8:4). It is merely a shadow of the NC μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν (10:1). If νόμος were the primary means of viewing Hebrews' claim to torah status, the conclusion would be, at best, ambivalent. Primarily because of the cultic connotation, Hebrews distances itself from the law's purview, merely stressing its inherent fallibility and impotence.<sup>62</sup>

Hebrews' muted assessment of νόμος must be seen in the broader context of its covenantal discourse. Without assuming torah status for itself, Hebrews makes a demanding case for the new διαθήκη possessing the authoritative status previously enjoyed by torah. Unlike Deuteronomy's torah self-designation, Hebrews' case is made not by authoritative statement, but by virtue of its ontological superiority to the

---

<sup>58</sup> The most recent examination is Barry Clyde Joslin, "The Theology of the Mosaic Law in Hebrews 7:1--10:18" (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005).

<sup>59</sup> H. Hübner, "νόμος, ου, ό" *EDNT* 2:471-77.

<sup>60</sup> So Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 363; Attridge, *Epistle*, 200. Koester, *Hebrews*, 114 differs, arguing that Hebrews still deals with ethical dimensions of the law; so also Lincoln, *Hebrews*, 78. Whilst Hebrews does deal with ethical matters, it does not seem to overtly link them with νόμος (cf. 13:1-5). Lincoln proposes that 9:19 understands the whole Sinai law, but the verse's emphasis is the role of blood in inaugurating the covenant, not a statement on the law's scope, and cannot bear the burden he places upon it.

<sup>61</sup> Although variants exist, ἐπ' αὐτῆς has the greatest volume. It could be viewed temporally – 'at the time of it' (i.e. the priesthood – so NRSV), but 7:12 directs attention to the Law's ontological, and not temporal, dependence on the priesthood. The genitive αὐτῆς normally carries the sense of "about" or "concerning" (so Koester, *Hebrews*, 353; Harm W. Hollander, "Hebrews 7:11 and 8:6: A Suggestion for the Translation of Nenomothetetai Epi," *BT* 30 (1979): 246-47), but the "intimate" association of law and priesthood in 7:12 requires that ἐπὶ be understood as "on the basis of" (so Attridge, *Epistle*, 200; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 371-72), even if this would normally take the dative (as in the parallel expression in 8:6). See also Horbury, "Aaronic," 236-42.

<sup>62</sup> Gutbrod, "νόμος," *TDNT* 4:1059-91: "the Law is weak for Paul because man does *not* do it, whereas for Hb. because *man* does it."



existing (torah) dispensation. Although a 'better νόμος' is never unambiguously verbalised, the writer does articulate a better covenant (7:22), hope (7:19), promises (8:6), sacrifices (9:23) and future (11:40); without specifically using κρείττονος, he also announces a better rest (4:3-10), priesthood (7:10-17), mediator (9:15) and covenant-giving moment (12:18-24). All of these aspects, but especially covenant and priesthood, are inextricably linked with the law, and derive their context from its existence (cf. κατὰ (τὸν) νόμον – 7:5, 7:16, 8:4, 10:8, 9:19, 9:22).<sup>63</sup> The overriding aim of the NC is that 'my torah' will be inscribed on people's hearts (8:10), thereby equating the fulfilment of the NC with the human appropriation of torah.<sup>64</sup> The Christ event has not necessarily removed the law – not in Pauline terms at least – but rather established a new order that assumes torah's authority. Whereas, in Deuteronomy, Moses' death passed authority onto torah, the 'death' of Moses' covenant transfers such 'torah authority' to Christ and the new διαθήκη.

The legal μετάρθεις announced in 7:12 is conversant with this view. Hollander opines that it pertains to particular regulations of the Law, rather than the Law itself, a change *in* rather than *of* Law.<sup>65</sup> Lincoln argues conversely, that a new νόμος itself (and not a change in regulation) is required; the "law as whole" is under the microscope.<sup>66</sup> The former suggestion, however, is the more persuasive. Although μετάρθεις is used elsewhere in the letter of Enoch's ascent or removal (11:5), it is better understood in 7:12 as 'change' or 'alteration.'<sup>67</sup> The context of the argument is Christ's priestly qualification – or lack of it under the former regulation. The Christ event has occasioned a change in the Law that legitimated his eternal, non-genealogical priesthood, but this amendment has not necessarily occasioned the removal of other torah-endorsed practices, or indeed the abrogation of torah itself. A better νόμος is implicitly held forth, one with superior christological status to its

---

<sup>63</sup> Gutbrod, *TDNT* 4:1078.

<sup>64</sup> The plural νόμους (8:10) may distinguish it from the cultic νόμος of the former διαθήκη; cf. Hübner, *EDNT* 2:477.

<sup>65</sup> Hollander, "Hebrews," 247.

<sup>66</sup> Lincoln, *Hebrews*, 78.

<sup>67</sup> So BDAG; also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 374.

predecessor, but whose various (non-cultic) practices it does not necessarily invalidate.<sup>68</sup>

The crux is the relationship between νόμος and διαθήκη, and the degree to which their respective semantic scopes overlap. Their frequent occurrence cautions against treating them interchangeably (νόμος never receives the positive endorsement accorded to διαθήκη and lacks the latter's characteristic designation as 'new' or 'second'), but since the new διαθήκη is intimately connected with priesthood, and priesthood and law are likewise "indissolubly bound together,"<sup>69</sup> Hebrews likely conceives of νόμος and διαθήκη as similarly entangled. Both the old and the new διαθήκη are legally enacted (νενομοθέτηται – 7:11, 8:6) and necessitate a change in the law (7:12). The logic of the comparison of 10:28-29 associates the infringement of the (Mosaic) law (10:28) with an affront to the very heart of the covenant (10:29); breaking of the law (whatever that may mean in the NC epoch) equates to breaking of the covenant. Whilst law and covenant are, therefore, not synonymous terms – they are never used interchangeably – they do exhibit a close connection. Joslin's pithy assessment is helpful: "One is able to speak of one without meaning the other, yet one is not able to speak of one without thinking of the other."<sup>70</sup> Hebrews' claim (or otherwise) to torah status may be understood not just in terms of νόμος, but also by reference to διαθήκη.

We argued above that the new διαθήκη is the lifeblood of Hebrews' community worldview; its scope evokes a way of living that is not just a doctrinal explication of Christ's priestly sacrifice, but an all-embracing call to worship.<sup>71</sup> The NC evokes a new worldview, a new self-perception for its audience that challenges the Sinai-sourced metanarrative that undergirded their previous existence. If νόμος

---

<sup>68</sup> Joslin, "Theology", 6 argues: "the work of Christ has transformed the Law, and this transformation involves both its internalization and fulfilment in the NC: the Law has forever been affected Christologically." Thus we differ slightly from Isaacs' contention that "Mosaic Torah's validity is confined to the age of the past... It is no longer operative in the new age inaugurated by Jesus" (Isaacs, *Sacred*, 116). The distinction between torah pre- and post-Christ is a question not of *validity*, but of *authority*.

<sup>69</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 372.

<sup>70</sup> Joslin, "Theology", 7n15. Koester's suggestion that "Hebrews refers to the 'Law' ... and the first or Mosaic 'covenant' ... with little difference of meaning" implies a false synonymy (Koester, *Hebrews*, 114).

<sup>71</sup> See 4.1.

and διαθήκη are interrelated concepts, it follows that a 'new' or 'better' torah is being likewise explicated with a similar basis for life.

Two points bear this 'better torah' thesis out. First, it is commensurate with Deuteronomy itself. Whilst the latter certainly ascribes torah some legislative dimension, its appeal is as much about its authoritative status as about legal prescription. Fishbane remarks that torah – especially from the Deuteronomic perspective – is "the entirety of the traditions – the historical, the hortatory and the legal."<sup>72</sup> Deuteronomic torah is the source of life and blessing (Deut 30:15), it comprises Israel's narrative, ideology and praxis; it is an all-consuming way of life. Najman suggests that Deuteronomy's concept of torah status extends "to *authoritative tradition as a whole*, including laws of many kinds, as well as narratives."<sup>73</sup> Hence any claim on Hebrews' part to assert 'torah' status must also extend to its engagement with the *traditum*; this kind of *traditum* engagement is precisely the process we argued for Hebrews' participation in within the previous section.

Second, in Hebrews' several *a fortiori* statements (2:2-4, 10:28-29, 12:25), the 'lesser' premise is explicitly toranic, appealing either to legal principle (10:28), or to events that assumed vicarious torah status through their source (2:2, 12:25). The 'greater' response – 'how much more' – appeals to NC obedience and observance; premised upon such toranic sanctions, NC exhortation acquires a status that is, at a minimum, torah, and, upholding the 'greater' sense, even more than torah.<sup>74</sup> Whilst Hebrews never explicitly ascribes torah status to the new dispensation, its articulation falls little short of that designation.

### **6.3.3 Re-presentation of Sinai**

Within the broad milieu of second temple Judaism, a group's depiction of the Sinai narrative provided a definitive means of self-justification or self-

---

<sup>72</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical*, 440.

<sup>73</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 30-31, my emphasis.

<sup>74</sup> Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 374: "The change of law introduces, not a state of lawlessness, but an order which imposes stricter obligations, and thus stricter penalties."

understanding,<sup>75</sup> an approach initiated and exemplified by Deuteronomy itself. In observing that the Sinai pericope provides the primary source of 1QS's self-portrait, James Vanderkam noted an earlier precedent: "we may say that Deuteronomy represents an early stage in reflection on the Sinai event, while the Community Rule represents a later one."<sup>76</sup> In the previous chapter, we discussed how Deuteronomy enacts a 'new' Moab covenant that draws on much Sinai material, but which 're-presents' it from a fresh vantage point and announces a new defining locus in Israel's story. Even for those who emphasize the fundamental distinction between Horeb and Moab, the latter is defined by its negation of the former, and, even in that limited sense, can be said to 're-present' it.

Sinai imagery is re-used within Hebrews, particularly for paraenetic purposes. Hebrews 2:2-3 justifies its exhortation to NC obedience by appeal to the rewards (or otherwise) of the Horeb event. It is on Sinai that God shows Moses the τύπος to be replicated on earth (8:5), whilst a blood sacrifice comparable to that from the Sinai covenant inauguration provides the framework for understanding the NC initiation (9:18-22). The journey from Sinai to Canaan forms a major heuristic motif for the letter in warning of the dangers of missing out on the heavenly rest (3:7-4:11) and Hebrews alludes to the Moab covenant and the handover to Joshua to describe the NC farewell to the Sinai epoch. Hebrews' dialogue with the Sinai narrative reaches its zenith in 12:18-24, but the theme is maintained in 12:25-26, where the audience is exhorted not to ignore the one who once spoke from Sinai (12:25).<sup>77</sup> Likewise, the reference to the (prior) divine shaking of the earth (12:26) most likely evokes the trembling of the mountain at Sinai (Exod 19:18; cf. Ps 68:8).

---

<sup>75</sup> C. Rowland, "Apocalyptic Literature," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 180: "Revelation is after all the heart of the Jewish religion: the manifestation of God's will to Moses on Mount Sinai. Nothing could be more characteristic of the kernel of Scripture than to claim continuity with the *character* of that original revelation, albeit in different circumstances and with a different process of authorisation at a later stage in Jewish history."

<sup>76</sup> James VanderKam, "Sinai Revisited," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 58.

<sup>77</sup> Because of the similar Moses/Christ comparison of 2:2-3, Moses is possibly the one here speaking ἐπὶ γῆς (so Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 234). More likely, it is God himself (Attridge, *Epistle*, 379; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 683-684). Elsewhere Hebrews uses χρηματίζω of God addressing Moses (8:5) and Noah (11:7) and divine speaking is paradigmatic for the letter (1:1-2). See Lane, *Hebrews*, 475-78. Cf. Gordon, *Hebrews*, 159: "God is the 'one who is speaking' in v.25, and in the remainder of the verse a contrast is made between Mt Sinai and God's current speaking, in respect of the locale of speaking. Sinai is characterised as divine speaking 'on earth'."

In view of Deuteronomy's re-presentation of Horeb, and Hebrews' frequent appeal to Sinai motifs, a case may be made that the epistle participates in a similar re-presentation process. The immediate context of 12:18-24 substantiates this. Hebrews 12:15-17 alludes in several ways to Deut 29, whose own explicit context is the Moab covenantal renewal; as Moab signifies the shift away from the Horeb era, Hebrews' allusion to Deut 29 rhetorically aligns Zion with Moab, anticipating the Sinai re-writing of 12:18-21.<sup>78</sup> Hebrews also uses the same material (Deut 4:11-2, 5:22; cf. Heb 12:18-19) in relation to the παλαιούμενον Sinai covenant that Deuteronomy itself employs to recall a similarly bygone era; both texts use Deut 4-5 in relation to an era no longer present for its audience.

The respective re-workings are not, however, identical. Although Horeb is conceptually 'past' for the Deuteronomist, Deuteronomy still accords it a decisive ongoing role in shaping Israel's history (cf. Deut 4:13-14, where Horeb instruction is the source of teaching for life in the land). Hebrews, on the other hand, relativizes Sinai to the benefit of the Zion dispensation. The emphatic οὐ at the beginning of 12:18 sounds Sinai's death knell and exhorts the audience to celebrate their participation in the Zion epoch. Where Sinai bred fear (12:21), Zion exhibits festal joy (12:22); where God was unapproachable (12:2), he is now accessible (12:23); where habitation was once impossible (12:20), righteous humanity now dwells (12:23). Where Moses is Sinai's primary protagonist (12:18-21), Jesus, the new covenant μεσίτης, holds centre stage on Mount Zion (12:22-24). With its accented antithesis between the two dispensations, the Sinai/Zion comparison is the most acute contrast in the whole letter and is rightly seen as the epistolary climax, rhetorically, exegetically and theologically.<sup>79</sup>

Even within this sharp distinction, continuity abounds. The depiction of Zion is "modelled to some extent on the pattern of Sinai";<sup>80</sup> it becomes a "new Sinai",<sup>81</sup> a Sinai pastiche, re-presented or, to use Najman's titular phrase, "seconded" within the context of the new covenant epoch. Hebrews' continuity/change dialectic reaches its

---

<sup>78</sup> Gordon, *Hebrews*, 153 likewise similarly observes that the allusion to Isa 35:3 in Heb 12:12 also places the audience contextually at Zion's threshold.

<sup>79</sup> Son, *Zion*, passim, especially 77-103.

<sup>80</sup> Peterson, *Hebrews*, 160.

<sup>81</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 296.

pinnacle,<sup>82</sup> as the Zion tapestry is elucidated in terms drawn from the Sinai era whose very fate it seals. Zion embraces Sinai's former status as the covenant inaugurating moment; "it is a covenant conclusion, modelled on the Sinai definitive pattern."<sup>83</sup> It consequently shares key aspects and participants of the Sinai narrative; present are YHWH, angels, Israel, mediator and blood. Ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων (Heb 12:23) appeals to the similar designation of Israel's wilderness assembly (Deut 4:10: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.... πρὸς με ἐκκλησίασον; cf. also 9:10, 18:16, 31:30),<sup>84</sup> and 'firstborn' may evoke images of wilderness Israel anticipating their impending inheritance (see Deut 32:43/Heb 1:6). Μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων (Heb 12:22) recalls the angelic gathering on Sinai (μυριάσιν Καδης ... ἄγγελοι – Deut 33:2) and, where the Decalogue was inscribed on stones (Deut 4:13) that were eventually broken (Deut 9:17), the names of the firstborn are registered in the heavens (Heb 12:23). Just as the Sinai community embraced a covenant that would ultimately lead them into their God-given Canaan inheritance, so the Zion assembly gather in expectation of the heavenly Jerusalem, the city to come (13:14), at whose threshold they imminently stand (12:22). Dumbrell's assessment of the Zion account is apposite:

the writer appears to be at pains to stress that the Sinai pattern has repeated itself, where Israel, the first-born, was called, having been chastened by discipline, was assembled at Sinai, was approved by God, was sprinkled with covenant blood by the interposition of a mediator and was then drawn into fellowship.<sup>85</sup>

Attridge similarly observes that within the Zion tradition, "the characteristics of the primordial theophany on Sinai were to be repeated on Zion at the end."<sup>86</sup> Hebrews embraces this tradition and re-presents the Sinai narrative as the experience of the NC community assembled before Mount Zion.

---

<sup>82</sup> Son, *Zion*, 78-82.

<sup>83</sup> Dumbrell, "Spirits," 158. See also Peterson, *Hebrews*, 160.

<sup>84</sup> The לָקָח root is found in the same context in Deut 5:22 (itself alluded to in Heb 12:18), but is rendered here as πάσαν συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν

<sup>85</sup> Dumbrell, "Spirits," 159.

<sup>86</sup> Attridge, *Epistle*, 374.

#### **6.3.4. Mosaic Provenance or Association**

Moses' primary role in Deuteronomy needs little justification; ascription of the law code to his teaching contributes greatly to establishing the book's authoritative status.<sup>87</sup> The pseudonymous association of Moses with the narration or provenance of subsequent Jewish texts (e.g. Jubilees, Temple Scroll, Assumption of Moses) testifies to the seminal vindicatory role his persona ascribed. Operating within this broad context of Mosaic authority, Hebrews asserts the supremacy of the Son, not by denigrating Moses' faithfulness, but rather by extolling Christ's superiority within the respective domains in which each exhibits faithfulness (3:1-6).<sup>88</sup> Son observes that the issue of Mosaic provenance may well have shaped the epistle's content:

It is perhaps that the author needed to prove the superiority of Jesus to Moses because of the general belief of the Jewish tradition concerning the supreme authority of the Mosaic revelation, which may have been regarded as possessing even higher authority over the revelation by the Son.<sup>89</sup>

The question of provenance impinges upon issues of authority and status within the letter, and the source of the new covenant is inextricably tied to the superiority of the one through whom it is inaugurated.

Hebrews does not ascribe absolute provenance to Moses. Within 11:23-28, he could be seen as merely one in a long list of faithful witnesses who die before receiving their reward (11:39-40; cf. 3:5).<sup>90</sup> The τηλικαύτης salvation was announced by the Lord (2:3), and Jesus, not Moses, is the μεσίτης of the NC (9:15, 12:24). Indeed, Hebrews does not even permit Moses Sinai covenant mediation – angels deliver the Horeb words (2:2) and the law-giving episode is noticeably absent from 11:24-28. Moses remains a servant in God's house (3:5), albeit faithfully so, whereas Christ remains over the house and thereby assumes superiority (3:6).

---

<sup>87</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical*, 436, 439-40; see Miller, "Moses," 245-55.

<sup>88</sup> "(The) contrast is not between the faithfulness of Jesus and Moses, but between the position in which each was faithful" – Brett R. Scott, "Jesus' Superiority over Moses in Hebrews 3:1-6," *BSac* 155 (1998): 209.

<sup>89</sup> Son, *Zion*, 127.

<sup>90</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 246 observes: "Identifying Moses as a 'witness' allowed Christians to affirm the importance of Moses and the Law without making them the bases of faith and life." Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 171 likewise notes that Moses is not presented as a national hero; given only ch.11, we would know nothing of his role as lawgiver and exodus figurehead.

Traditionally the heroic protagonist of Sinai, Hebrews' Moses cowers fearfully before the divine theophany of the holy mountain (12:21).

Mosaic provenance of the NC dispensation is not completely eschewed by Hebrews. On the contrary, the letter upholds Mosaic association with the NC inauguration, partly, as we have seen, in terms of Zion's continuity with Sinai, but more especially by ascribing particular experiences to Moses that locate him within the NC milieu. Jones asserts: "Moses and Jesus are yoked throughout the entirety of the epistle" and Moses becomes "a heuristic device" for comprehending its message.<sup>91</sup> He is regarded in the letter higher than any other human figure bar Christ,<sup>92</sup> and is faithful in all God's house (3:5); the shift in comparative subject between chapters 2 and 3, from angels to Moses, is an upward transition of authority, not a downward movement.<sup>93</sup> He is an ἁστέιον child (11:23), the witness *par excellence* as the only OT figure who specifically foreshadows Christ's suffering for the people of God (11:25-26); his reproach (ὀνειδισμός – 11:26) prefigures the same denunciation (ὀνειδισμός) that Christ will endure (13:13) and which demarks the life of the obedient believer (10:35, 13:13).<sup>94</sup> Most significantly for our purposes, Hebrews recounts two incidences in which Moses encounters aspects of the NC reality to which no other μάρτυς is privy (8:5, 11:26-27). Whilst Moses is not the provenance of the NC discourse, he alone is given prior disclosure of its actuality.

Citing Exod 25:40, Heb 8:5 categorises the content of Moses' mountain top revelation as a τύπος, the LXX rendering of תבנית, also translated in the same context as παράδειγμα (Exod 25:9). Hebrews 8:5 leaves the precise content of the τύπος ambiguous,<sup>95</sup> focusing instead upon the temporal superiority of the (true) heavenly sanctuary and the potential demise of its earthly counterpart. The question arises whether Moses' revelation is merely a blueprint,<sup>96</sup> model<sup>97</sup> or pattern<sup>98</sup> of the

---

<sup>91</sup> Jones, "Figure," 95-96. He further notes: Moses is "in mind from the opening sentence (1:1-2) to the benediction (13:20-21)" (103).

<sup>92</sup> On Heb 11, Bulley, "Death," 416 remarks: Moses "receives the fullest encomiastic treatment with attention paid to his 'family, birth, nature, nurture, education, [and] accomplishments.'"

<sup>93</sup> So Scott, "Moses," 203; contra Son, *Zion*, 109.

<sup>94</sup> DeSilva, *Despising*, 194.

<sup>95</sup> A. B. Davidson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: 1882), 158 observes that the means by which Moses 'sees' the τύπος (i.e. as vision or as reality) also remains ambiguous. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 217 counters that Moses did not see the entities "as they are", but only "according to human comprehension."

<sup>96</sup> Long, *Hebrews*, 89.



heavenly realities, or the very realities themselves.<sup>99</sup> The lexical terms are opaque; תבנית can be used of both the structure and the plan from which it was to be built,<sup>100</sup> whilst τύπος, generically at least, is normally the imprint or mark of something, with the existence of that archetype not necessarily implied. Yet Hebrews appears to invest ἀντίτυπος (9:24) with the 'imprint' sense traditionally accorded to τύπος, the latter perhaps reflecting the actual imprinted 'reality'. As a minimum, Moses' instruction must be visible (cf. ὄρα – 8:5)<sup>101</sup> and imbibed with significant attention to detail (hence the warning to pay such detailed attention when constructing the earthly σκηνή).

Even if Moses' τύπος is merely a model, this is not incompatible with awareness of the NC actuality; divine revelation has taken place (Moses' receives – δειχθέντα – instruction) and, as such, uniquely in the letter, he is privy to YHWH's ultimate covenantal intentions. However, a plausible case may be made that Moses is actually exposed to the full heavenly realities. Hebrews acknowledges the existence of some form of heavenly sanctuary that is the archetype of the Mosaic earthly σκηνή,<sup>102</sup> both temporally and spatially (8:2, 9:23-24), the true tent already pitched by the Lord (8:2).<sup>103</sup> Appeal to the reality of the heavenly temple does not imply Platonic categories, even if the language is borrowed from that milieu, as the idea of a pre-existent heavenly temple is a relative commonplace within contemporary Jewish thought, especially apocalyptic, with Exod 25:40 one of the contributory

---

<sup>97</sup> DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 282.

<sup>98</sup> F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 184-85; Isaacs, *Sacred*, 73; Koester, *Hebrews*, 374.

<sup>99</sup> Lindars, *Theology*, 83; D'Angelo, *Moses*, 201-58; Wright, *Hebrews*, 83.

<sup>100</sup> Aelred Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspectives* (St. Meinrad, Ind.: Grail, 1960), 16 favours "a sort of blueprint or model according to which some work is carried out, but not necessarily a full-blown prototype or archetype." Also Attridge, *Epistle*, 222: "the term more likely means plan than model."

<sup>101</sup> So Peterson, *Hebrews*, 131: it is "something more objective than verbal instructions."

<sup>102</sup> For a dissenting view, see Isaacs, *Reading*, 107-08.

<sup>103</sup> The mention of the ἁληθινός tabernacle in 8:2 makes us doubt Löhr's contention that 8:5 only bespeaks the inferiority of the earthly tent, with no comparison to a heavenly one intended: "mit dem Zitat (und dem vers 5 insgesamt) solle einfach die Minderwertigkeit des irdischen Heiligtumes dargelegt werden, ohne dass hier ein Vergleich mit dem himmlischen überhaupt beabsichtigt" – Hermut Löhr, "'Umriß' und 'Schatten': Bemerkungen zur Zitierung von Ex 25,40 in Hebr 8," *ZNW* 84 (1993): 222n22

texts.<sup>104</sup> Hence there seems to be no compelling reason to conceive of the construction of the temple as a purely future eschatological event;<sup>105</sup> rather, Hebrews is familiar with this notion of an eternal heavenly temple and reflects its temporal priority throughout his argument.<sup>106</sup> Such precedence means that ὑπόδειγμα (8:5) should be understood as 'copy' rather than its more common sense of 'example' (cf. 4:11).<sup>107</sup>

The additional πάντα within the citation of Exod 25:40<sup>108</sup> may also suggest, as D'Angelo argues,<sup>109</sup> that the full gamut of heavenly worship was conveyed to Moses. Bearing in mind other contemporary Moses-visionary traditions (2 Bar 4:2-7, 59:4), Hebrews likely plays upon these and advocates that he witnessed, however prophetically, the reality of the heavenly sanctuary in which the exalted Christ serves. Davidson rightly observes: "It is scarcely in accordance with the Author's mode of representation that any distinction should be drawn between that which Moses was shown and the heavenly things themselves."<sup>110</sup>

The other reference to Moses' special awareness is Heb 11:27, where, in departing from Egypt,<sup>111</sup> he is described as τὸν ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν, the 'invisible'

---

<sup>104</sup> Otfried Hofius, *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine Exegetisch-Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19f und 10,19f* (WUNT 14; Tübingen: Mohr, 1972), 55-56. See also the survey of Attridge, *Epistle*, 222-24.

<sup>105</sup> Contra L. D. Hurst, "How 'Platonic' Are Heb. viii.5 and ix.23f?" *JTS* 34 (1983): 156-68. See the critique in Son, *Zion*, 177-180. Hurst concedes that Moses can have a genuine vision of the (future) heavenly reality: "there is no difficulty in harmonizing the essential futurity of the ideal sanctuary from Moses' point of view with his vision of it on the mount if it is remembered that in Judaism, future entities may be apprehended in the present through prophetic vision" (167n54).

<sup>106</sup> The argument in 8:5 is temporal as much as spatial (so F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 184; also Peterson, *Hebrews*, 131 – the ἀληθινός temple is eternal). Cf. Son, *Zion*, 179: "the ἀληθινός temple set up by the Lord comes first, whereas the ὑπόδειγμα built by Moses follows afterwards."

<sup>107</sup> See Attridge, *Epistle*, 219.

<sup>108</sup> This may reflect a variant LXX *Vorlage*; Ambrosianus possesses the reading, but possibly under Hebrews' own influence. Philo's citation of Exod 25:9 includes πάντα (*Leg.* 3.102) and Hebrews likely found the reading conducive for his purposes – so Thomas, "Citations," 309.

<sup>109</sup> D'Angelo, *Moses*, 208.

<sup>110</sup> Davidson, *Epistle*, 158.

<sup>111</sup> The following contexts are offered for Moses' exit:

- a) the Midian escape and subsequent burning bush encounter (F. Bruce, *Epistle*, 312-13). Although this may contradict Exod 2:14-15, which cites Moses' fear of Pharaoh, Lane, *Hebrews*, 375 observes how both Philo and Josephus narrate the episode omitting Moses' fear (*Leg.* 3.14; *Mos.* 1.49-50; *Ant.* 2.254-56).

being probably God himself. The phrase is admittedly ambiguous and may be understood either qualitatively ('as if one seeing') or causatively ('because he saw'). Most commentators prefer the former explanation, appealing, with good cause, to the definition of faith as the certainty of things οὐ βλεπομένων (11:1). The fact, however, that Moses is *twice* ascribed visual experience (11:26 – ἀπέβλεπεν; 11:27 – ὁρῶν), gives good reason to consider that Hebrews views Moses exceptionally as having experienced some visual phenomena which, whilst not the full (visible) reward (11:26), were sufficient grounds for perseverance in adversity and reproach. Precisely because seeing is downplayed in 11:1, the double mention of Mosaic vision – especially of the ὁράτον – cannot be dismissed lightly. Whilst 11:27 primarily appeals to Moses' exemplary faith, the author accords him a particular visionary perspective denied to any other μάρτυς figure; other heroes exhibit prophetic capability (Isaac, Jacob, Joseph), but none 'see' in the way that Moses 'sees'.<sup>112</sup> The biblical record, with which Hebrews is invariably consistent, acknowledged that Moses spoke with YHWH 'face-to-face' (Exod 33:11, Num 12:8, Deut 34:10), and it seems perfectly possible that such instances are appealed to at this point.

The opaque reference to Moses enduring the ὀνειδισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (11:26) may provide further insight. Various options are offered as to the referent of χριστοῦ,<sup>113</sup> and possible allusions to LXX Pss 68:8-10 or 88:51-52 may symbolically associate Moses' reproach with that of his fellow Israelites (χριστοῦ σου parallels δούλων σου in Ps 88:51-52; cf. Heb 11:25). It seems hard, though, to ignore – in the context of Hebrews' pervasive Son christology – an association with Jesus Christ himself,<sup>114</sup> and it is unlikely, therefore, that Moses is depicted as a

- 
- b) the Exodus itself (Westcott, *Hebrews*, 373). This breaks the chronological order, misplacing the exodus before the Passover (11:28).
  - c) a general depiction of Moses' actions in leaving Egypt (D'Angelo, *Moses*, 59; Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 170; Koester, *Hebrews*, 503-04). D'Angelo appeals to Philo's conception of the various episodes as "a manifold event with a single meaning" – cf. *Mos.* 1.148-162.

Option c) is most likely; it emphasizes Hebrews' general characterisation of Moses as a visionary figure. He 'sees' the divine revelation both in the burning bush and at Sinai.

<sup>112</sup> Abraham *et al* 'see' by faith (11:13) – no visionary experience is assumed.

<sup>113</sup> See the discussion in Attridge, *Epistle*, 341-42; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 193-95; D'Angelo, *Moses*, 48-53; Isaacs, *Sacred*, 141-44.

<sup>114</sup> Koester, *Hebrews*, 502.

generic "anointed one" figure.<sup>115</sup> It may be that he merely prefigures<sup>116</sup> or anticipates<sup>117</sup> the (later) sufferings of Christ (analogously more than typologically), and is presented as a paradigm of faithful endurance in suffering. However, ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ is best understood primarily as the actual sufferings of Christ, and not sufferings done for his sake;<sup>118</sup> the writer seems to import awareness of the (future) passion into the Moses narrative, a chronological anachronism that begs further explication.<sup>119</sup> Similarly, the subsequent explanatory γὰρ (11:26) suggests that Moses' prophetic insight accounts for or sustains him in assessing the relative value of the reproach and that this somehow becomes grounds for endurance. If ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ has the same referent as 13:13 – i.e. Christ's paschal suffering – then, implicitly at least, Hebrews' Moses has been made aware of the parameters of the Christ event; "the verse (i.e. 11:26) implies that Moses chose this reproach because he knew it to be the reproach of Christ."<sup>120</sup>

Hebrews casts Moses as a visionary figure, who, by virtue of seeing the unseeable, has become party to parameters of the NC revelation.<sup>121</sup> The precise content of such revelation remains unclear, and, bearing in mind the ambiguity of 11:26-27, any conclusions should be tentative. D'Angelo, for example, probably goes beyond the textual evidence in advocating that Moses actually sees the pre-existent Son of God;<sup>122</sup> likewise, Hanson's suggestion that Moses spoke with Christ himself in the burning bush lacks any formal epistolary warrant.<sup>123</sup> The implication of some

---

<sup>115</sup> Westcott, *Hebrews*, 372.

<sup>116</sup> Hering, *L'Épître*, 109.

<sup>117</sup> Williamson, *Philo*, 363.

<sup>118</sup> Isaacs, *Sacred*, 141.

<sup>119</sup> Manson, *Epistle*, 79-80 observes that Hebrews' Christ becomes a participant in the Exodus narrative.

<sup>120</sup> D'Angelo, *Moses*, 64n122. See also A. T. Hanson, "The Reproach of the Messiah in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Studia Evangelica* 2; (ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone; TUGAL 126; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982), 231-33.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Isaacs, *Sacred*, 143-144: "the future Christ seems to be included in the content of Moses' vision of unseen realities. ... Moses was granted foresight of God's plan." Also Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 197: Hebrews "assumed that Moses foresaw the Messiah Jesus and acted accordingly." See also David M. Hay, "Moses through New Testament Spectacles," *Int* 44 (1990): 244.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. D'Angelo, *Moses*, 177: "the glory of God which Moses saw, the divine Word by which were created heaven and earth, this is the son of God, Jesus."

<sup>123</sup> Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 107.

form of visionary revelation, however, remains; as in 8:5, Moses is made privy to the contours of God's plan – he sees its future rewards (11:26) – and his faithfulness to God flows accordingly.

By ascribing such awareness of the Christ tradition to Moses, Hebrews locates the text within and engages the 'Mosaic provenance' discourse, but at the same time, establishes the NC's superiority by rooting his interpretation ultimately in the exalted, (possibly) pre-existent Christ.<sup>124</sup> Najman herself remarks on the similarity between Hebrews and Jubilees in their respective appeals to a *pre-Sinaitic* authority,<sup>125</sup> and the epistle's superiority motif fits well within this paradigm. Christ's priesthood is eternal and prior to that of Aaron, whilst his supremacy over Moses is premised upon superior standing within the house of God (3:5-6). What Moses 'initiated' or 'authored' was ultimately ineffective, but there is a superior paradigm or covenant to which he bore witness. Hebrews acknowledges the conventional Mosaic framework, but 'trumps' it with a model both ontologically and temporally superior.<sup>126</sup> Since Deut 34:10-12 opined that a prophet like Moses has never yet come forth, the provenance of the NC discourse must be located in someone greater than the prophets.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> Hebrews' articulation of Christ's pre-existence remains a disputed issue: for a sceptical approach, see Caird, "Son," passim; James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM, 1989), 206-09.

<sup>125</sup> Najman, *Seconding*, 125n39. Though note 7:28.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. *T. Mos.* 1:14. This may imply Moses' pre-existence, or, more likely, his pre-existent election to fulfil a mediatorial role (cf. David L. Tiede, "The Figure of Moses in the Testament of Moses," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg Jr.; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 90), but, in either case, Moses' participation is given temporal superiority.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. Najman, *Seconding*, 40. Also Isaacs, *Sacred*, 143: Hebrews renders "Judaism's supreme mediatorial figure both the forerunner of Christ, and subordinate to him who is the content of Mosaic revelation." Richard N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (SBT 2/17; London: SCM, 1970), 37 suggests that 1:1-2 establishes a Moses/Jesus dialectic from the outset, predicated upon Jesus as the "Prophet of eschatological consummation" (Deut 18:15-19).

## **Ch.7: Conclusion**

Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω? We have stated our respective conclusions at various stages throughout the thesis, and our concern here is finally to sum up and synthesize our prior findings. Our analysis of the various points of intertextual interface between Deuteronomy and Hebrews has revealed a number of pertinent correspondences between the two texts. In chapter three, we identified twenty-one citations of Deuteronomy within the epistle, the vast majority of which derive from both texts' paraenetic material. Such a high volume of textual borrowing gives good reason to conceive of some intertextual exchange functioning between the two discourses; Hebrews' usage of Deuteronomistic material would seem to exhibit some broader context or purpose, and is not purely accidental. We have found a particularly strong relationship between Hebrews and the Song of Moses (Deut 32) and have proposed that the epistle's usage of the hymn owes much to the latter's position in Deuteronomy. Hebrews understands it as the Song of witness, addressed to Israel at the threshold of entry into the land, inextricably intertwined with the handover of leadership to Ἰησοῦς. Whilst the Song's status as an independent 'hymn' contributed to its widespread usage and familiarity within Second Temple Judaism, for Hebrews at least, its Deuteronomistic provenance is critical to its application.

We have also found that Hebrews' intertextual engagement with Deuteronomy goes well beyond formal citation. The letter works with themes borrowed from the OT texts and uses such themes to sustain its paraenetic agenda. The goal of the land remains the symbolic destiny of the faithful in both texts, with entry into the κατάπαυσις achieved only under the leadership of Ἰησοῦς. Old covenantal blessing and cursing sanctions derivative from Deuteronomy are re-applied to Hebrews' new covenant discourse, in the same way that the epistle mirrors Deuteronomy's use of the wilderness generation as the paradigm of faithlessness. In both texts, the fatal consequences of that generation's apostate actions are held up as the fundamental negative exemplar; the forefathers' disobedience at Kadesh Barnea and the subsequent failure to enter Canaan is, for both, the quintessential manifestation of ἀπιστία. Hebrews also plays off, and so replicates, the two-covenant narrative of the Deuteronomistic text. Drawing often upon language and imagery derived from Deut 29 and its Moab (new/second) covenant context,

Hebrews outlines its own new covenant discourse that similarly bids farewell to the Mosaic era of the Sinai covenant.

Such frequent engagement with Deut 29 and Deut 32 seems more than accidental; it happens consistently throughout the letter's hortatory material, gives collective explanatory power to the epistle's admonitions, and *in toto* composes a perspective of new covenant handover at the threshold of the land. In chapter one, we pondered whether Hebrews' paraenetic sections possessed an overarching framework. The volume of intertextual exchange we have identified encourages the conclusion that the Deuteronomic posture might comprise such a unifying narrative for the letter's exhortations. The frequent textual citation of Deuteronomy, the replication of key themes such as covenant and land, the adoption of the Song and its association with the end of the Mosaic era all point to an overarching re-presentation of the Deuteronomic choice between life and death, apostasy and faithfulness, blessing and curse. Deuteronomy's paraenesis becomes Hebrews' paraenesis.

Hebrews, therefore, does not just use Deuteronomy; it becomes a new Deuteronomy and challenges its predecessor's contemporary hegemony. In chapter six, we argued that Hebrews re-presents – just as Deuteronomy re-presents – and, in so doing, participates in a broader debate about Israel's identity and narrative that reworks or rewrites such themes through christological spectacles. By undertaking this intertextual engagement with Deuteronomy, the epistle's writer transfers his audience away from their allegiance to an outdated, redundant Sinai existence, dons Mosaic garments and addresses them afresh on the plains of Moab. Within Hebrews' new covenant situation, the exhortation to "Choose Life" remains as pressing as ever.

## **Bibliography**

- Abegg, Martin G. "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians." Pages 81-97 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo. Vol. 71 of Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Abegg, Martin G., Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Albl, Martin C. "*And Scripture Cannot Be Broken*": *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 96. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Retelling the Old Testament." Pages 99-121 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Allen, David M. "More Than Just Numbers: Deuteronomistic Influence in Hebrews 3:7-4:11." *Tyndale Bulletin* forthcoming.
- Allison, Dale C. *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- Andriessen, P.C.B. "La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de Hé 1:6 et 2:14b-3:2." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 293-313.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Paraenesis in a Homily (Λόγος Παρακλήσεως): The Possible Location of, and Socialization in, the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'." *Semeia* 80 (1990): 211-226.
- Attridge, Harold W. "The Psalms in Hebrews." Pages 197-212 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. *The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Aune, David Edward. *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*, Library of Early Christianity 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Austin, J. L., J. O. Urmson, and G. J. Warnock. *Philosophical Papers*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Backhaus, Knut. "Das Land der Verheissung: die Heimat der Glaubenden im Hebräerbrief." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 171-188.
- Bakker, A. "Christ an Angel? A Study of Early Christian Docetism." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 32 (1933): 255-265.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.



- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Barker, Margaret. *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Barker, Paul A. *The Triumph of Grace in Deuteronomy: Faithless Israel, Faithful Yahweh in Deuteronomy*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004.
- Barr, James. "Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant." Pages 23-28 in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie*. Edited by Walther Zimmerli, Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart, and Rudolf Smend. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 363-393 in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by David Daube and W. D. Davies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Barth, Marcus. "The Old Testament in Hebrews: An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics." in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*. Edited by W. Klassen and G. W. Snyder. London: SCM, 1962.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, J. T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux. *Qumran Cave I, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 1*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Basser, Herbert W. *In the Margins of the Midrash: Sifre Ha'azinu Texts, Commentaries, and Reflections*, South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Basser, Herbert W. *Midrashic Interpretations of the Song of Moses*, American University Studies. Series VII: Theology and Religion; Vol. 2. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Bateman, Herbert W. IV. *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage*, American University Studies: Series VII Theology and Religion 193. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Bauckham, Richard. *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Apocalypses." Pages 135-187 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter Thomas O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Vol. 2/140 of Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." Pages 435-487 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Vol. 72 of Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- Bauckham, Richard. "Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1." Pages viii, 264 p. in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North. Vol. 263 of Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Beale, G. K. *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Bell, Richard H. *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/63. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Bertholet, Alfred. *Deuteronomium*, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament 5. Freiburg: Mohr (Siebeck), 1899.
- Black, C. Clifton. "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Reponse to Lawrence Wills." *Harvard Theological Review* 81 Ja (1988): 1-18.
- Bleek, Friedrich. *Der Hebräerbrief*. Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1868.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. "The Church in Hebrews." Pages 133-151 in *Vision for the Church*. Edited by Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Michael B. Thompson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Bogaert, Pierre-M. "Les Trois Rédactions Conservées et la Forme Originale de L'envoi du Cantique de Moïse (Dt 32,43)." Pages 329-340 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Edited by N. Lohfink. Vol. 68 of Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Sonschaft und Leiden." Pages 188-198 in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift Für Joachim Jeremias*. Edited by Walter Eltester. Vol. 26 of Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin: Topelmann, 1960.
- Boston, J. R. "The Song of Moses: Deuteronomy 32:1-43." PhD diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1967.
- Boston, James R. "Wisdon Influence Upon the Song of Moses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 198-202.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Bowman, John. *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion, and Life*. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977.
- Bratcher, Robert Galveston. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. Rev. ed, Helps for Translators 3. London, 1967.

- Braulik, Georg. "Die Ausdrücke Für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium." *Biblica* 51 (1970): 39-66.
- Braun, Herbert. *An die Hebräer*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1984.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. "Predestination in Deuteronomy 30:1-10." Pages 171-188 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie. Vol. 268 of *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Bristol, Lyle O. "Primitive Christian Preaching and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 68 (1949): 89-97.
- Britt, Brian M. *Rewriting Moses: The Narrative Eclipse of the Text*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 402. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Brooke, George G. "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 35-57 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. Vol. 28 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Message of Deuteronomy: Not by Bread Alone*, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1993.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Message of Hebrews: Christ above All*, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1982.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain. *The Epistle to the Hebrews. The First Apology for Christianity. An Exegetical Study*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rev. ed, NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *To the Hebrews: Translation, Comment and Conclusions*, Anchor Bible 36. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972.
- Bulley, Alan D. "Death and Rhetoric in the Hebrews 'Hymn to Faith'." *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* 25 (1996): 409-423.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Burch, V. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: its Sources and Message*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1936.
- Burden, Terry L. *The Kerygma of the Wilderness Traditions in the Hebrew Bible*, *American University Studies. Series 7. Theology and Religion*; V.163. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

- Cadwallader, Alan H. "The Correction of the Text of Hebrews Towards the LXX." *Novum Testamentum* 34 (1992): 257-292.
- Caird, G. B. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. London: Duckworth, 1980.
- Caird, George B. "Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5 (1959): 44-51.
- Caird, George B. "Son by Appointment." Pages 73-81 in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Cairns, Ian. *Word and Presence: A Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*, International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Calvin, Jean. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter*. Translated by William B. Johnston. Calvin's Commentaries. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1963.
- Calvin, John. *Harmony of the Pentateuch*. Translated by Charles William Bingham. 4 vols. Vol. 4, Calvin's Commentaries. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1855.
- Carlson, R. A. *David, the Chosen King: A Tradition-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel*. Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964.
- Carlston, Charles Edwin. "Eschatology and Repentance in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 296-302.
- Casey, Juliana. "Eschatology in Heb. 12:14-29: An Exegetical Study." PhD diss., Catholic University of Leuven, 1977.
- Cassuto, Umberto. *Biblical and Oriental Studies*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1973.
- Chapman, Stephen B. "'The Law and the Words' as a Canonical Formula within the Old Testament." Pages 26-74 in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Charles, J. Daryl. "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 33 (1990): 171-178.
- Chennattu, Rekha M. *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Chester, Andrew. "Citing the Old Testament." Pages 141-169 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. London: SCM, 1979.

- Cholewinski, A. "Zur Theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes." *Biblica* 66 (1985): 96-111.
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, Word Biblical Commentary 6b. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002.
- Clavier, H. "Ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ dans L'Épître aux Hébreux." Pages 81-93 in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893-1958*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Clements, R. E. *The Book of Deuteronomy: A Preacher's Commentary*, Epworth Commentaries. Peterborough: Epworth, 2001.
- Clements, R. E. *Deuteronomy*, Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee. "Hebrews 1:6: Source and Significance." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 9 (1999): 51-64.
- Cody, Aelred. *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspectives*. St. Meinrad, Ind.: Grail, 1960.
- Colijn, Brenda B. "'Let Us Approach': Soteriology in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 39 (1996): 571-586.
- Collins, J.J. "Testaments." Pages 325-355 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- Cosby, Michael R. *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11: In Light of Example Lists in Antiquity*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Craddock, Fred B. "Hebrews." Pages 1-174 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander Keck. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period." Pages 128-140 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Croy, N. Clayton. *Endurance in Suffering: Hebrews 12:1-13 in its Rhetorical, Religious, and Philosophical Context*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert. *Deuteronomy: Introduction and Commentary*, Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM, 1951.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 42. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Davidson, A. B. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Handbooks for Bible Classes. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, The Biblical Seminar 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Davies, W. D. "A Note on Josephus, Antiquities 15.136." Pages 84-88 in *Jewish and Pauline Studies*. Edited by London: SPCK, 1984.
- Deissmann, Gustav Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.
- Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- deSilva, David A. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 152. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- deSilva, David A. "Exchanging Favor for Wrath: Apostasy in Hebrews and Patron-Client Relationships." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 91-116.
- deSilva, David A. *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Deurloo, Karel A. "The One God and All Israel in its Generations." Pages 31-46 in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C.J.Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Vol. 53 of Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- DeVries, Simon John. *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: Time and History in the Old Testament*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- Dillard, Raymond B. and Tremper Longman. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Leicester: Apollos, 1995.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*, Stone Lectures; 1950. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Bible and the Greeks*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- Dods, Marcus, Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, W. O. E. Oesterley, James Moffatt, and J. D. White. *The Expositor's Greek Testament IV*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.
- Dogniez, Cécile and Marguerite Harl. *La Bible D'Alexandrie. 5, Le Deutéronome*. Paris: Cerf, 1992.

- Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. 3rd ed, International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Dumbrell, William J. "Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect." *Evangelical Quarterly* 48 (1976): 154-159.
- Duncan, Julie A. "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 43-62.
- Duncan, Julie A. "Deuteronomy, Book Of." Pages 198-202 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1989.
- Dunnill, John. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Eisele, Wilfried. *Ein Unerschütterliches Reich: die Mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche 116. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela. "The Virtue of Suffering, the Necessity of Discipline, and the Pursuit of Perfection in Hebrews." Pages 331-353 in *Asceticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Leif E. Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela Michelle. *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 156. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *Das Lied Moses, Deuteronomium 32, 1-43, und das Lehrgedicht Asaphs, Psalm 78, Samt Einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes*, Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig Philologisch-Historische Klasse Bd. 104, Heft 5. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Ellingworth, Paul. "New Testament Text and Old Testament Context in Heb. 12.3." Pages 89-96 in *Studia Biblica 1978*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Vol. 3 of Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Ellingworth, Paul and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*, Helps for Translators. London: United Bible Societies, 1983.

- Emmrich, Martin. "Hebrews 6:4-6 -- Again! (a Pneumatological Inquiry)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 83-95.
- Enns, Peter. "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1-4:13." *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993): 255-280.
- Esler, Philip F. "Collective Memory and Hebrews 11: Outlining a New Investigative Framework." Pages 151-171 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. Vol. 52 of Semeia Studies. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Evans, Craig A. "Covenant in the Qumran Literature." Pages 55-80 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo. Vol. 71 of Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism; V.58. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Fisch, Harold. *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation*, Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Fischer, John. "Covenant, Fulfillment and Judaism in Hebrews." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 13 (1989): 175-187.
- Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Fishbane, Michael A. "Varia Deuteronomica." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1972): 349-352.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.
- Forkman, Göran. *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity*, Coniectanea Biblica: NT Series 5. Lund: Gleerup, 1972.
- Fraade, Steven D. *From Torah to Commentary: Torah and its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Fraade, Steven D. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and the Curses." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 150-161.
- France, R. T. "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor." *Tyndale Bulletin* 47 (1996): 245-276.
- Freedman, David Noel ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.



- Freedman, David Noel and David Miano. "People of the New Covenant." Pages 7-26 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C R. De Roo. Vol. 71 of Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Freyne, Seán. "Reading Hebrews and Revelation Intertextually." Pages 83-93 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Israel*. Edited by Spike Draisma. Kampen, Netherlands: J H Kok, 1989.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1987.
- Gelardini, Gabriella. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha Be-Av: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation." Pages 107-27 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Vol. 75 of Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Geller, Stephen A. *Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Georgi, Dieter. "Hebrews and the Heritage of Paul." Pages 239-244 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Vol. 75 of Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Gheorgita, Radu. *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/160. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003.
- Glasson, Thomas Francis. "Plurality of Divine Persons and the Quotations in Hebrews 1:6ff." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1966): 270-272.
- Gleason, Randall C. "Angels and the Eschatology of Heb 1-2." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 90-107.
- Gleason, Randall C. "The Eschatology of the Warning in Hebrews 10:26-31." *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2002): 97-120.
- Gleason, Randall C. "The Old Testament Background of Rest in Hebrews 3:7-4:11." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 157 (2000): 281-303.
- Gleason, Randall C. "The Old Testament Background of the Warning in Hebrews 6:4-8." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155 (1998): 62-91.
- Goldingay, John. *Israel's Gospel*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Gordon, Robert P. *Hebrews, Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Goulder, Michael. "Hebrews and the Ebionites." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 393-406.

- Gray, Patrick. *Godly Fear: The Epistle to the Hebrews and Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition*, Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Grogan, G. W. "Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18." *Vox Evangelica* 6 (1969): 54-71.
- Grossfeld, Bernard. *The Aramaic Bible. Vol.9, the Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy; Translated, with Apparatus, and Notes*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Grossman, Maxine. "Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity." Pages 117-131 in *Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by James R. Davila. Vol. 46 of Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Grässer, Erich. "Das Wandernde Gottesvolk: zum Basismotiv des Hebräerbriefes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 77 (1986): 160-179.
- Grässer, Erich. *Der Alte Bund im Neuen: Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 35. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985.
- Guthrie, Donald. *Hebrews*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1983.
- Guthrie, George, "Old Testament in Hebrews." Pages 841-850 in *Dictionary of the Later New Testament & its developments*. Edited by Ralph P. Martin and Peter H. Davids. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1997.
- Guthrie, George H. *Hebrews*, The NIV Application Series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Guthrie, George H. "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 1 (2003): 271-294.
- Guthrie, George H. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 73. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Hebrews: Based on the New International Version*, New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 14. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Hahn, Scott. "A Broken Covenant and the Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15-22." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004): 416-436.
- Hahn, Scott. "Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994-2004)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 3, no. 2 (2005): 263-292.
- Hahn, Scott Walker. "Kinship by Covenant: A Biblical Theological Study of Covenant Types and Texts in the Old and New Testaments." PhD, Marquette University, 1995.

- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert Gerald. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man a Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Hanhart, Robert. "Die Söhne Israels, die Söhne Gottes und die Engel in der Masora, in Qumran und in der Septuaginta." Pages 170-178 in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur Biblischen Hermeneutik, Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- Hanson, A. T. "Hebrews." Pages 292-302 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Hanson, A. T. "The Reproach of the Messiah in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 231-240 in *Studia Evangelica 2*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Vol. 126 of *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Harl, Marguerite. "Le Pêché Irrémissible de L'Idolâtre Arrogant: Dt 29,19-20 dans la Septante et chez D'autres Témoins." Pages 63-78 in *Tradition of the Text*. Edited by Gerard J. Norton and Stephen Pisano. Vol. 109 of *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Harl, Marguerite. "Le Grand Cantique de Moïse en Deutéronome 32: Quelques Traits Originaux de la Version Grecque des Septante." Pages 183-201 in *Rashi 1040-1990: Hommage À Ephraïm E. Urbach: Congrès Européen des Études Juives*. Edited by Gabrielle Sed-Rajna. Paris: Cerf, 1993.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34." Pages 59-70 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg Jr. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "The Bible Rewritten." Pages 239-247 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "A Factor of Old Testament Influence in the Old Testament." *Expository Times* 27 (1925-26): 6-11.
- Hay, David M. "Moses through New Testament Spectacles." *Interpretation* 44 (1990): 240-252.
- Hays, Richard. *Echoes of the Scriptures in the Writings of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

- Hays, Richard. "'Here We Have No Lasting City': New Covenantalism in Hebrews." Paper presented at the Hebrews & Theology Conference. University of St. Andrews, July 19th 2006.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Head, Peter M. "The Curse of Covenant Reversal: Deuteronomy 28:58-68 and Israel's Exile." *Churchman* 111 (1997): 218-226.
- Heiser, Michael S. "Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158 (2001): 52-74.
- Helyer, Larry R. "The Prototokos Title in Hebrews." *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 6, no. 2 (1976): 3-28.
- Héring, Jean. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament XII. Neuchatel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1954.
- Hewitt, Thomas. *The Epistle to the Hebrews. An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. London, 1960.
- Hillers, Delbert R. *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Hofius, Otfried. *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine Exegetisch-Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19f und 10,19f*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 14. Tübingen: Mohr, 1972.
- Hofius, Otfried. *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom Endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 11. Tübingen: Mohr, 1970.
- Holladay, William L. and Paul D. Hanson. *Jeremiah*. 2 vols, Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Hollander, H. W. *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 6. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Hollander, H.W. and M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Hollander, Harm W. "Hebrews 7:11 and 8:6: A Suggestion for the Translation of Nenomothetetai Epi." *The Bible Translator* 30 (1979): 244-247.
- Holmgren, Fredrick C. *The Old Testament & the Significance of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM, 1998.
- Horbury, William. "Septuagintal and New Testament Conceptions of Church." Pages 1-17 in *A Vision for the Church: Studies in Early Christian Ecclesiology in*

*Honour of J.P.M. Sweet*. Edited by Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Michael B. Thompson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

Horbury, William. "The Aaronic Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 227-254 in *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies*. Edited by William Horbury. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Horbury, William. "Monarchy and Messianism in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 79-128 in *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. Vol. 195 of *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar, Erich Zenger, Linda M. Maloney, and Klaus Baltzer. *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51-100*, Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Howard, George E. "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations." *Novum Testamentum* 10 (1968): 208-216.

Hübner, Hans. *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990-1995.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 285-295.

Hugenberger, Gordon. *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage, Developed from the Perspective of Malachi*, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 52. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Hughes, Graham. *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Hughes, John J. "Hebrews 9:15ff and Galatians 3:15ff: A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure." *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979): 27-96.

Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Hughes, Philip E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Hurst, L. D. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*, Society for the Study of the New Testament Monograph Series 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hurst, L. D. "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2." Pages 151-164 in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*. Edited by L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Hurst, L. D. "How 'Platonic' Are Heb. viii.5 and ix.23f?" *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983): 156-168.

Isaacs, Marie E. *Reading Hebrews and James: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.

- Isaacs, Marie E. *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 73. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, eds. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jewett, Robert. *Letters to Pilgrims: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. New York: Pilgrim, 1981.
- Jobes, Karen H. and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Hebrews: A Commentary*, The New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2006.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. "The Scriptural World of Hebrews." *Interpretation* 57 (2003): 237-250.
- Johnson, Richard W. *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 209. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Johnsson, William G. "Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 239-251.
- Johnston, George. "Christ as Archegos." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 381-385.
- Johnston, George. "Οἰκουμένη and κόσμος in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964): 352-360.
- Jones, C. P. M. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings." Pages 113-143 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Jones, Peter Rhea. "The Figure of Moses as a Heuristic Device for Understanding the Pastoral Intent of Hebrews." *Review and Expositor* 76 Wint (1979): 95-107.
- Jones, Peter Rhea. "A Superior Life: Hebrews 12:3-13:25." *Review and Expositor* 82 (1985): 391-405.
- Joslin, Barry Clyde. "The Theology of the Mosaic Law in Hebrews 7:1--10:18." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005.
- Kaiser, Walter. "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130 (1973): 135-150.
- Karrer, Martin. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint." Pages 335-353 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. Vol. 53 of Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

- Katz, Peter. "Hebrews 13:5: The Biblical Source of the Quotation." *Biblica* 33 S (1952): 523-525.
- Katz, Peter. "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* (1958): 213-223.
- Kellermann, Bill. "The Curse and Blessing of the Wilderness: The Risky Inheritance of Hebrews." *Sojourners* 14, no. 6 (1985): 24-27.
- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, Studies in Religion. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1984.
- Kennicott, Benjamin, John Douglas, Ernst Friedrich Karl Rosenmüller, and Paulus Jacobus Bruns. *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum: Cum Variis Lectionibus*. 2 vols. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1776.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Διαθήκη in Hebrews." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 68 (1977): 263-265.
- Kistemaker, Simon. *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: Soest, 1961.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
- Kline, Meredith G. *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy - Studies and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.
- Knight, George A. F. *The Song of Moses: A Theological Quarry*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Knoppers, G. N. "Ancient near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996): 670-97.
- Koester, Craig R. "The Epistle to the Hebrews in Recent Study." *Currents in Research* 2 (1994): 123-145.
- Koester, Craig R. "Hebrew, Rhetoric, and the Future of Humanity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 103-123.
- Koester, Craig R. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham. "The Literary Genre 'Testament'." Pages 259-267 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Kooij, Arie van der. "The Ending of the Song of Moses: On the Pre-Masoretic Version of Deut 32:43." Pages 93-100 in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C.J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by

- Florentino García Martínez. Vol. 53 of Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Kugel, James L. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Kugler, Robert A. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Kugler, Robert A. "Testaments." Pages 189-213 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter Thomas O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Vol. 2.140 of Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001.
- Kurz, William S. *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament*, Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990.
- Käsemann, E. *Das Wanderende Gottesvolk*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 37. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*, New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1968.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Hebräer 12,12-17." Pages 308-312 in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Laansma, Jon. *I Will Give You Rest: The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/98. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997.
- Laberge, Leo. "Le Texte de Deutéronome 31 (Dt 31,1-29; 32,44-47)." Pages 143-160 in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*. Edited by C. Brekelmans and J. Lust. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
- Labuschagne, C. J. "The Setting of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy." Pages 111-129 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature*. Edited by M. Vervenne and J. Lust. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Labuschagne, C. J. "The Song of Moses: Its Framework and Structure." Pages 85-98 in *De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus Van Selms*. Edited by I. H. Eybers et al. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1-8: Hebrews 9-13*. 2 vols, Word Biblical Commentary 47A-47B. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Laub, Franz. *Bekenntnis und Auslegung: Die Paränetische Funktion der Christologie im Hebräerbrief*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1980.
- Lehmann, Manfred R. "'Yom Kippur' in Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961): 117-124.
- Lehne, Susanne. *The New Covenant in Hebrews*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 44. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.



- Lenchak, Timothy A. *"Choose Life!" A Rhetorical-Critical Investigation of Deuteronomy 28,69 - 30,20*, Analecta Biblica 129. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993.
- Leonard, William. *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament*. London: Vatican Polyglot, 1939.
- Leschert, Dale F. *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms*, NABPR Dissertation Series 10. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1994.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston, 1985.
- Levenson, Jon D. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?" *Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975): 203-233.
- Levinson, Bernard M. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period." in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T&T Clark International, forthcoming.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Hebrews: A Guide*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. "Sabbath, Rest, and Eschatology in the New Testament." Pages 198-220 in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*. Edited by Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 382-406.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*, New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Torah in Deuteronomy." Pages 117-36 in *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Loader, William R. G. *Sohn und Hohepriester: Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 53. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab: Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dt 28:69-32:47." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 6, no. 1 (1962): 32-56.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "The Deuteronomistic Picture of the Transfer of Authority from Moses to Joshua." Pages 234-247 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

- Lohfink, Norbert. "The Problem of Individual and Community in Deuteronomy 1:6-3:29." Pages 227-233 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Lombard, H. A. "Katapausis in the Letter to the Hebrews." *Neotestamentica* (1971): 60-71.
- Long, Thomas G. *Hebrews*, Interpretation Series. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, Studies in Biblical Theology 2/17. London: SCM, 1970.
- Lundbom, Jack R. "Lawbook of the Josianic Reform." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 293-302.
- Luyten, J. "Primeval and Eschatological Overtones in the Song of Moses (Dt 32,1-43)." Pages 341-347 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Edited by N. Lohfink. Vol. 68 of Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985.
- Löhr, Hermut. ""Heute, Wenn Ihr Seine Stimme Hört." Zur Kunst der Schriftanwendung im Hebräerbrief und in 1 Kor 10." Pages 226-248 in *Schriftauslegung im Antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Hermut Löhr. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Löhr, Hermut. *Umkehr und Sünde im Hebräerbrief*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift Für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche 73. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Löhr, Hermut. ""Umriss" und "Schatten": Bemerkungen zur Zitierung von Ex 25,40 in Hebr 8." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 84 (1993): 218-232.
- Löhr, Hermut. "Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews." Pages 199-210 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Vol. 75 of Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- MacDonald, Nathan. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism"*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/1. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003.
- Mann, Thomas W. *The Book of the Torah: The Narrative Integrity of the Pentateuch*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1988.
- Mann, Thomas W. "Theological Reflections on the Denial of Moses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 481-494.
- Manson, William. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration*, Baird Lectures; 1949. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Kept by the Power of God: A Study of Perseverance and Falling Away*. London: Epworth, 1969.

- Martin-Achard, R. "Quelques Remarques sur la Nouvelle Alliance chez Jérémie (Jer. 31,31-34)." Pages 141-164 in *Questions Disputées D'Ancien Testament: Méthode et Théologie*. Edited by C. Brekelmans. Vol. 33 of Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974.
- Mathewson, Dave. "Reading Heb 6:4-6 in Light of the Old Testament." *Westminster Theological Journal* 61 (1999): 209-225.
- Mausser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness. The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*, Studies in Biblical Theology 39. London: SCM, 1963.
- Mayes, A. D. H. *Deuteronomy: Based on the Revised Standard Version*, NCB Commentary. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*, Analecta Biblica 21. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. *The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants*. Nottingham: InterVarsity, 1985.
- McConville, J. G. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- McConville, J. G. "Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic Literature." Pages 11-40 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Vol. 72 of Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- McConville, J. G. and J. Gary Millar. *Time and Place in Deuteronomy*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 179. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- McConville, J. Gordon. *Deuteronomy*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary 5. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002.
- McCullough, J. C. "The Impossibility of a Second Repentance in Hebrews." *Biblical Theology* 20 (1974): 1-7.
- McCullough, J. Cecil. "Isaiah in Hebrews." Pages 159-173 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- McCullough, John C. "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980): 363-379.
- McKnight, Scot. "The Warning Passages of Hebrews: A Formal Analysis and Theological Conclusions." *Trinity Journal* 13 (1992): 21-59.

- McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Meier, John P. "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14." *Biblica* 66 (1985): 168-189.
- Meier, John P. "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14." *Biblica* 66 (1985): 504-533.
- Mendenhall, G. E. "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition." *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954): 50-76.
- Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar Über das Neue Testament 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Michel, Otto. "Zur Auslegung des Hebräerbriefes." *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963): 189-191.
- Millar, J. Gary. *Now Choose Life: Theology and Ethics in Deuteronomy*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 6. Leicester: Apollos, 1998.
- Millar, J. Gary. "'A Faithful God Who Does No Wrong': History, Theology and Reliability in Deuteronomy." Pages 3-17 in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture*. Edited by Paul Helm and Carl R. Trueman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Miller, Patrick D. *Deuteronomy*, Interpretation Bible Commentary. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
- Miller, Patrick D., Jr. "Deuteronomy and Psalms: Evoking a Biblical Conversation." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 3-18.
- Miller, Patrick D., Jr. "Moses My Servant: The Deuteronomic Portrait of Moses." *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 245-255.
- Mitchell, Alan C. "The Use of Precept and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 681-701.
- Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Moessner, David P. "Jesus and the Wilderness Generation: The Death of the Prophet Like Moses According to Luke." Pages 319-340 in *SBL Seminar Papers 1982*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Moffatt, James. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, International Critical Commentary 40. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924.
- Montefiore, H. W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A&C Black, 1964.
- Moor, Johannes Cornelis de. *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 91. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

- Morrison, Michael Duane. "Rhetorical Function of the Covenant Motif in the Argument of Hebrews." PhD diss, Fuller Theological Seminary, 2006.
- Motyer, Stephen. "The Psalm Quotations of Hebrews 1: A Hermeneutic-Free Zone?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 50 (1999): 3-22.
- Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, Continuum Biblical Studies Series. London: Continuum, 2001.
- Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament." Pages 14-41 in *Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North*. Edited by Steve Moyise. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Murray, Scott R. "The Concept of Diatheke in the Letter to the Hebrews." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 66 (2002): 41-60.
- Nairne, Alexander. *The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second-Temple Judaism*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Najman, Hindy. "Torah of Moses: Pseudonymous Attribution in Second Temple Writings." Pages 202-216 in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation. Vol.2, Tractate Shabbat*, Brown Judaic Studies 270. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. *Deuteronomy and Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.
- Nielsburg, George W. E. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, Harvard Theological Studies 26. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Nielsen, Eduard. *Deuteronomium*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament 1/6. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995.
- Nigosian, Solomon A. "The Song of Moses (Dt 32): A Structural Analysis." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 72 (1996): 5-22.
- Nixon, Robin Ernest. *The Exodus in the New Testament*, The Tyndale New Testament Lecture 1962. London: Tyndale, 1963.
- Nongbri, Brent. "A Touch of Condemnation in a Word of Exhortation: Apocalyptic Language and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric in Hebrews 6:4-12." *Novum Testamentum* 45 (2003): 265-279.

- Noth, Martin. "The Re-Presentation of the Old Testament in Proclamation." *Interpretation* 15 (1961): 50-60.
- Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. 1, Die Sammelnden und Bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. Halle (Saale): M. Niemeyer, 1943.
- O'Day, Gail, "Intertextuality." Pages 546-548 in of *Dictionary of biblical interpretation*. Edited by John Haralson Hayes. 2 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- Oberholtzer, Thomas Kem. "The Warning Passages in Hebrews, Pt 1: The Eschatological Salvation of Hebrews 1:5-2:5." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 83-97.
- Oberholtzer, Thomas Kem. "The Warning Passages in Hebrews, Pt 5: The Failure to Heed His Speaking in Hebrews 12:25-29." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 146 (1989): 67-75.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "Hebrews as Amplification." Pages 375-387 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Vol. 90 of *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Olson, Dennis T. *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New: The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 71. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Olson, Dennis T. *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading, Overtures to Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994.
- Oropeza, B. J. "Apostasy in the Wilderness: Paul's Message to the Corinthians in a State of Eschatological Liminality." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 75 (1999): 69-86.
- Paget, James Carleton. *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2/64. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel*. Leicester: Apollos, 2000.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *The Story of Israel: A Biblical Theology*. Leicester: Apollos, 2004.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav Jan and Daniel E. Poellot, eds. *Luther's Works. Vol. 9, Lectures on Deuteronomy*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1960.
- Perlitt, Lothar. *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*, *Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 36. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Peterson, David. *Hebrews and Perfection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

- Peterson, David. "The Prophecy of the New Covenant in the Argument of Hebrews." *Reformed Theological Review* 36-38 (1978): 74-81.
- Peterson, David. "God and Scripture in Hebrews." Pages 118-138 in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture*. Edited by Paul Helm and Carl R. Trueman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Religion in the Old Testament: The History of a Spiritual Triumph*. London: A&C Black, 1961.
- Pfizzner, V. C. *Hebrews*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- Phillips, Anthony. *Deuteronomy*, Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Porter, J. R. "The Succession of Joshua." Pages 102-132 in *Proclamation and Presence*. Edited by John I. Durham and J. R. Porter. Richmond, Va: John Knox, 1970.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." Pages 79-96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Vol. 148 of Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Potter, Harry D. "The New Covenant in Jeremiah 31:31-34." *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 347-357.
- Preuss, Horst Dietrich. *Deuteronomium*, Erträge der Forschung 164. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982.
- Priest, J. "Testament of Moses." Pages 919-934 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Proctor, John. "Judgement or Vindication? Deuteronomy 32 in Hebrews 10:30." *Tyndale Bulletin* 55 (2004): 65-80.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "Ancient Word and Living Word: The Preaching of Deuteronomy and Our Preaching." *Interpretation* 15 (1961): 3-13.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 47. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1929.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Translated by Dorothea Barton, The Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1966.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch." Pages 1-78 in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1975.

- Rad, Gerhard von. "Promised Land and Yahweh's Land." Pages 79-93 in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker, Studies in Biblical Theology 9. London: SCM, 1953.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "There Still Remains a Sabbath Rest for the People of God." Pages 94-102 in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966.
- Reichert, Andreas. "The Song of Moses (Dt 32) and the Quest for Early Deuteronomic Psalmody." Pages 53-60 in *Proceedings of the 9th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, Aug 1985*. Edited by Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986.
- Rhodes, James N. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/188. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- Riley, Gregory J. *One Jesus, Many Christs: How Jesus Inspired Not One True Christianity, but Many: The Truth About Christian Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Rissi, Mathias. *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs: Ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und Seiner Leser*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/41. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987.
- Robinson, Theodore H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Moffatt NT Commentary. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931.
- Rofé, Alexander. "The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:43)." Pages 164-172 in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium*. Edited by Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann. Vol. 190 of *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Rofé, Alexander. "The Covenant in the Land of Moab (Dt 28,69-30,20): Historico-Literary, Comparative, and Formcritical Considerations." Pages 310-320 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Edited by N. Lohfink. Vol. 68 of *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985.
- Rowland, C. "Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 170-189 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Royster, Dmitri. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
- Römer, Thomas. "The Book of Deuteronomy." Pages 178-212 in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Edited by Steven L.



- McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham. Vol. 182 of *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Sabourin, Leopold. "Crucifying Afresh for One's Repentance (Heb 6:4-6)." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 6 (1976): 264-271.
- Salevao, Iutisone. *Legitimation in the Letter to the Hebrews: The Construction and Maintenance of a Symbolic Universe*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 219. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Salvesen, Alison. *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, *Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph* 15. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1991.
- Sanders, Paul. *The Provenance of Deuteronomy* 32, *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Sandvik, Bjørn. *Das Kommen des Herrn Beim Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 58. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. "A Celebration of the Enthroned Son: The Catena of Hebrews 1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001): 469-485.
- Schneider, Heinrich. "Die Biblischen Oden im Christlichen Altertum." *Biblica* 30 (1949): 28-65.
- Scholer, John M. *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 49. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. and Ardel B. Caneday. *The Race Set before Us: A Biblical Theology of Perseverance and Assurance*. Leicester: InterVarsity, 2001.
- Schröger, Friedrich. *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*, *Biblische Untersuchungen* 4. Regensburg: Pustet, 1968.
- Scott, Brett R. "Jesus' Superiority over Moses in Hebrews 3:1-6." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155 (1998): 201-210.
- Scott, James M. "Paul's Use of Deuteronomistic Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 645-665.
- Scott, Julius J. "Archegos: The Salvation History of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 29 (1986): 47-54.
- Seebass, Horst. "Garizim und Ebal als Symbole von Segen und Fluch." *Biblica* 63 (1982): 22-31.
- Sellin, E. "Wann Wurde das Moseslied Deut. 32 Gedichtet?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43 (1928): 161-173.
- Silberman, Lou H. "Prophets/Angels: LXX and Qumran Psalm 151 and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 91-101 in *Standing before God: Studies on Prayer in*

*Scriptures and in Tradition with Essays in Honor of John M. Oesterreicher.*  
Edited by Asher Finkel and Lawrence Frizzell. New York: Ktav, 1981.

Skehan, Patrick W. "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumran."  
*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 136 (December 1954):  
12-15.

Skehan, Patrick W. "Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (Deut 32:1-  
43)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 13 (1951): 153-163.

Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson. *Qumran Cave 4. 4,  
Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts, Discoveries in the Judaean  
Desert* 9. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Smillie, Gene. "Continuity in Heb 1:1-2." *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 543-  
560.

Smillie, Gene R. "'O Logos tou Theou" in Hebrews 4:12-13." *Novum Testamentum*  
46 (2004): 338-359.

Smith, D. Moody. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New." Pages 3-65 in *The  
Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays; Studies in Honor of  
William Franklin Stinespring*. Edited by James M. Efird. Durham, N.C.:  
Duke University Press, 1972.

Snyman, A. H. "Hebrews 6:4-6: From a Semiotic Discourse Perspective." Pages 354-  
368 in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches & Results*.  
Edited by Jeffrey T. Reed and Stanley E. Porter. Vol. 170 of *Journal for the  
Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series*. Sheffield: Sheffield  
Academic Press, 1999.

Son, Kiwoong. *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18-24 as a Hermeneutical  
Key to the Epistle*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes:  
Paternoster, 2005.

Sonnet, Jean-Pierre. *The Book within the Book: Writing in Deuteronomy*, Biblical  
Interpretation Series 14. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Sowers, Sidney G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the  
Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the  
Hebrews*. Richmond: John Knox, 1965.

Spicq, Ceslas. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Gabalda, 1953.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the  
Letters of Paul*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in  
the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge  
University Press, 1992.

Stanley, Steve. "A New Covenant Hermeneutic: The Use of Scripture in Hebrews 8-  
10." *Tyndale Bulletin* 46 (1995): 204-206.

- Stanley, Steve. "The Structure of Hebrews from Three Perspectives." *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994): 245-271.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das Gewalttsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
- Stegner, William Richard. "The Ancient Jewish Synagogue Homily." Pages 51-69 in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*. Edited by David E. Aune. Vol. 21 of *SBL Sources for Biblical Study*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Stek, John H. "'Covenant' Overload in Reformed Theology." *CTJ* 29 Ap (1994): 12-41.
- Steuernagel, Carl. *Das Deuteronomium*. 2nd ed, Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1/3.1. Göttingen, 1923.
- Steyn, Gert Jacobus. "A Quest for the Vorlage of the "Song of Moses" (Deut 32) Quotations in Hebrews." *Neotestamentica* 34 (2000): 263-272.
- Stranahan, Brainerd P. "Bunyan and the Epistle to the Hebrews: His Source for the Idea of Pilgrimage in the Pilgrim's Progress." *Studies in Philology* 79 (1982): 279-296.
- Stuckenbruck, L. T., "Angels of the Nations." Pages 29-31 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Leicester: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/70. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995.
- Swetnam, James. "Hebrews 10,30-31: A Suggestion." *Biblica* 75 (1994): 388-394.
- Swetnam, James. "Jesus as Logos in Heb 4:12-13." *Biblica* 62 (1981): 214-224.
- Swetnam, James. "On the Literary Genre of the "Epistle" to the Hebrews." *Novum Testamentum* 11 (1969): 261-269.
- Swetnam, James. "Suggested Interpretation of Hebrews 9:15-18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965): 373-390.
- Synge, Francis Charles. *Hebrews and the Scriptures*. London: SPCK, 1959.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Community of the Renewed Covenant." Pages 3-24 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Charles Ulrich and James C. VanderKam. Vol. 10 of *Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

- Talstra, E. "Deuteronomy 31: Confusion or Conclusion? The Story of Moses' Threefold Succession." Pages 87-110 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature*. Edited by M. Vervenne and J. Lust. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Thackeray, H. St J. *Josephus, the Man and the Historian*, The Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929.
- Thiessen, Matthew. "The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123 (2004): 401-424.
- Thomas, Kenneth J. "Old Testament Citations in Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 11 (1965): 303-325.
- Thompson, James W. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 13. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.
- Thurén, Jukka. "Gebet und Gehorsam des Erniedrigten." *Novum Testamentum* 13 (1971): 136-146.
- Tiede, David L. "The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 278-286.
- Tiede, David L. "The Figure of Moses in the Testament of Moses." Pages 86-92 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg Jr. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy: Devarim*, The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2nd ed, Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 10. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Trompf, Garry W. "Conception of God in Hebrews 4:12-13." *Studia theologica* 25, no. 2 (1971): 123-132.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "Paul, Scripture and Ethics: Some Reflections." *New Testament Studies* 46 (2000): 403-424.
- Überlacker, Walter. "Paraenesis or Paraclesis - Hebrews as a Test Case." Pages 319-352 in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen and James M. Starr. Vol. 125 of *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Ulrich, Eugene Charles, Frank Moore Cross, Sidnie White Crawford, and Julie Ann Duncan. *Qumran Cave 4. V 9, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, Discoveries in the Judean Desert XIV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

- VanderKam, James. "Sinai Revisited." Pages 44-60 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- William A. VanGemeren, ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 3 vols. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "L'οἰκουμένη dans L'Épître aux Hébreux." *Biblica* 45 (1964): 248-253.
- Vanhoye, Albert. *La Structure Littéraire de 'L'epître aux Hébreux'*. 2e rev. ed. Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1976.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "Longue Marche ou Accès Tout Proche? Le Contexte Biblique de Hébreux 3:7-4:11." *Biblica* 49 (1968): 9-26.
- Vanhoye, Albert. *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1-2*. Paris: Cerf, 1969.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "Héb 6:7-8 et le Mashal Rabbinique." Pages 527-532 in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1984.
- Venema, G. J. *Reading Scripture in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 9-10; 31, 2 Kings 22-23, Jeremiah 36, Nehemiah 8*, Oudtestamentische Studiën 48. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Verbrugge, Verlyn D. "Towards a New Interpretation of Hebrews 6:4-6." *Calvin Theological Journal* 15 (1980): 61-73.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Revised ed. London: Penguin, 2004.
- Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, Studia Post-Biblica 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Vos, Geerhardus. "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke." *Princeton Theological Review* XIV (1916): 1-61.
- Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "in Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 101. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Walker, P. W. L. *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Waters, Guy Prentiss. *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/221. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2006.
- Watson, Duane F. "Rhetorical Criticism of Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles since 1978." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 5 (1997): 175-207.

- Watson, Duane Frederick. *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Watts, James W. *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 139. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Weeks, Noel. "Admonition and Error in Hebrews." *Westminster Theological Journal* 39 (1976): 72-80.
- Weinfeld, M. "The Covenant of Grant in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184-203.
- Weinfeld, M. "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 17-56.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "B<sup>c</sup>rît - Covenant Vs Obligation." *Biblica* 56 (1975): 120-128.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Grace after Meals in Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 427-440.
- Weiss, Hans-Friedrich. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 15th ed, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar Über das Neue Testament 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Weitzman, Steven. "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 49-61.
- Weitzman, Steven. "Lessons from the Dying: The Role of Deuteronomy 32 in its Narrative Setting." *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994): 377-393.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Westcott, B.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long. *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*, Library of New Testament Studies 297. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Wevers, J. W. "The Attitude of the Greek Translator Towards His Parent Text." Pages 498-505 in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift Für Walter Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart, and Rudolf Smend. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

- Wevers, John William. *Deuterionomium*, Septuaginta; V.3,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Wevers, John William. *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Wevers, John William. "The LXX Translator of Deuteronomy." Pages 57-89 in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Wider, David. *Theozentrik und Bekenntnis: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Redens Gottes im Hebräerbrief*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche 87. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Wiebe, John M. "The Form, Setting and Meaning of the Song of Moses." *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 17, no. 2 (1989): 119-163.
- Williamson, Ronald. "The Incarnation of the Logos in Hebrews." *Expository Times* 95 O (1983): 4-8.
- Williamson, Ronald. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Wills, Lawrence. "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity." *Harvard Theological Review* 77 (1984): 277-299.
- Wilson, R. McL. *Hebrews*, New Century Bible Commentary. Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1987.
- Wilson, Stephen G. *Leaving the Fold: Apostates and Defectors in Antiquity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- Windisch, Hans. *Der Hebräerbrief*. 2nd ed, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1931.
- Witherington, Ben. "The Influence of Galatians on Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 146-152.
- Worley, David Ripley. *God's Faithfulness to Promise: The Hortatory Use of Commissive Language in Hebrews*. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1998.
- Wray, Judith Hoch. *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth: Early Christian Homiletics of Rest*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 166. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. *Deuteronomy*, NIBC Old Testament Series 4. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Wright, G. E., "Deuteronomy." Pages 309-537 in vol. 2 of *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1952.

- Wright, George Ernest. "Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32." Pages 26-67 in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage; Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Wright, N. T. *Hebrews for Everyone*. London: SPCK, 2003.
- Wright, N. T. *New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God; V.1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Wuest, Kenneth S. *Hebrews in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader*. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1947.
- Yeo, Khiok-Khng. "The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of 'Rest' (Katapausis and Sabbatismos) in Hebrews 3:7-4:13." *Asia Journal of Theology* 5 (1991): 2-33.
- Zerwick, Max and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. rev. ed. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.
- Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.